

BR
305
W61

Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME
FROM THE

SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF

Henry W. Sage

1891

A 2.10.33.3

8/2/1907

JUL 29 1949

~~MAY 20 1972 M~~

~~MLC 13 79 N 5~~


Cornell University Library
BR305 .W61

Reformation; being an outline of the his



3 1924 029 240 178

olin



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

THE REFORMATION

BEING AN OUTLINE OF
THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH
FROM A.D. 1503 TO A.D. 1648

BY THE REV.

JAMES POUNDER WHITNEY, B.D.

CHAPLAIN OF S. EDWARD'S, CAMBRIDGE; HULSEAN LECTURER (1906-7)
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF KING'S COLLEGE; LIGHTFOOT AND
WHEWELL SCHOLAR, CAMBRIDGE; FORMERLY PRINCIPAL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BISHOP'S COLLEGE
LENNOXVILLE, CANADA

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1907

D

8/2/07

~~7604~~ C 99

A. 210333

Am

EDITORIAL NOTE

WHILE there is a general agreement among the writers as to principles, the greatest freedom as to treatment is allowed to writers in this series. The volumes, for example, will not be of the same length. Volume II., which deals with the formative period of the Church, is, not unnaturally, longer in proportion than the others. To Volume VI., which deals with the Reformation, is allotted a similar extension. The authors, again, use their own discretion in such matters as footnotes and lists of authorities. But the aim of the series, which each writer sets before him, is to tell, clearly and accurately, the story of the Church, as a divine institution with a continuous life.

W. H. HUTTON

P R E F A C E

THE series deals with the history of the Church Universal as a historic body: bodies separated either from the Eastern or Western Church have therefore only been dealt with indirectly. I have tried to be fair to all schools of thought and all the men of the time.

Some controversies I have not dealt with at length. My own view of that on the continuity of the English Church (the only view, as I think, according with history) underlies my statement of history in Chapter XII., although it has not affected the treatment. The controversy on Papal Infallibility reaches through the whole period, but its historic beginnings go back to medieval days, and its full discussion belongs to a later volume. The Reformation added little to it, and many, both supporters and opponents, failed to distinguish between the primitive claims of the Church and the medieval claims of the Papacy.

I must acknowledge my personal indebtedness to my teacher and friend, Dr. A. W. Ward, Master of Peterhouse; in a less degree to the late Lord Acton; to the Rev. W. H. Hutton, for much kindness and many suggestions; Professor F. C. Burkitt, for corrections and the reference to S. Cyprian on page 198; the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, Chaplain of King's College, for much kind help with proofs; the publishers for much forbearance.

Volume IV. of the Cambridge History appeared too late for use, but I should like to add a reference to it here.

J. P. WHITNEY

S. Andrew's Day, 1906

CONTENTS

	CHAPTER I	PAGE
INTRODUCTION		1
CHAPTER II		
THE PAPACY AND THE LATERAN COUNCIL		15
CHAPTER III		
GERMANY AND THE REFORMATION UP TO 1529 . . .		23
CHAPTER IV		
THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND AND ITS CONNECTION WITH GERMANY		63
CHAPTER V		
THE REFORMATION IN SCANDINAVIA AND FRANCE . .		85
CHAPTER VI		
GERMANY AFTER 1529		107
CHAPTER VII		
THE COUNCIL OF TRENT		123
CHAPTER VIII		
THE THIRD ASSEMBLY AT TRENT		167

CHAPTER IX

	PAGE
CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL	216

CHAPTER X

MONASTIC REFORM AND THE JESUITS	264
-------------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI

GERMANY: 1555-1648	286
------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII

ENGLAND//	320
---------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIII

THE//NETHERLANDS: FRANCE: THE JESUITS	376
-------------------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIV

SCANDINAVIA: RUSSIA: THE GREEK CHURCH: MISSIONS	398
-------------------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XV

THE PAPACY AFTER TRENT	429
BIBLIOGRAPHY	457
NOTE	464
INDEX	471

THE REFORMATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE great work of the Medieval Church had been to evangelise the nations of the West. In the East it had to maintain itself against Mahomedanism : in the West it succeeded in gaining young and growing nations and moulded them to new ideals of life. The power of the Medieval world lay partly in the loftiness of its ideals, and partly in the strength of its institutions. No age ever showed in individual lives a keener sense of duty, a greater readiness for self-sacrifice ; the ideals of the monastic life, of the Mendicant Friars, of the greater bishops and of the simpler parish priests, can hardly be surpassed. No age ever threw greater strength into its institutions, as we see even more in religious than in political or social life. The conception of the great Christian society, with its common brotherhood and common life, appealed to the very best side of Medieval nature. Under the leadership of the great Roman See, with its apostolic traditions, its missionary zeal, its practical ability, and its advantages inherited from the Empire, the younger nations of the

West formed a real Christian commonwealth, expressed in the Church and in the Holy Roman Empire. As these nations developed a more vigorous life of their own, the importance of the Empire grew less, and there were even signs, in legislation, in literature, and in diversified tendencies, that it might be hard to combine the vigour of the separate lives with the common unity of the Church. But the Middle Ages, never surprised at contradictions between ideals and facts, had scarcely felt this difficulty to press.

The great Medieval Popes had been, as a rule, the assertors of moral force, the guardians of ecclesiastical unity. If sometimes they laid more stress on the organisation of the moral force than on the principles underlying it; if they did not always discriminate between ecclesiastical unity and their own control (which was the readiest means of enforcing it), these tendencies were natural to the time. For the Middle Ages turned naturally to organising and forming institutions, and the genius of Rome was at its best in practical order and detail. The medieval mind, always quick to seize an idea, had grasped with fervent faith the idea of ecclesiastical unity; it was not given to criticising the forms in which ideas were expressed unless some practical difficulty arose. Broadly speaking, the unity of the Western Church at the close of the Middle Ages meant to most minds the power of the Papacy. The separation of the Eastern Church was indeed a difficulty, but it stood remote from Western life, and at the Council of Florence had reached a temporary union with its brethren. But other issues had brought a greater difficulty closer; the contests of Popes and Emperors,

The
Papacy.

the abasement of the sojourn at Avignon, the scandal of the Schism, the discussions of the Conciliar movement, the many questions raised between Popes and kings, and even in the hierarchy itself: all these had left behind a mass of thought and literature, undigested by the generations who inherited it, remote for the most part from their lives and need, but awaiting examination and certain to be examined. But Papal obedience and ecclesiastical unity had been so long practically identical that to question the former might easily seem to impair the latter. Far-sighted critics like Sir Thomas More could see that here lay the problem of the coming time.

The later Popes had indeed forced on this problem. The connection between Italy and Germany—the legacy of the Empire—had entangled the Papacy in politics. Italy had a nicely Italy and Germany. balanced State-system of its own, while Germany, with its lack of central power and its sharp local divisions, was politically the least stable State of Europe. This relation, therefore, led to many complications and disturbances, intensified by other causes. The appearance of the French in Italy opened up new possibilities to the Papacy after it safely brought its power, increased rather than diminished, through the storms of the Councils of the West. By a process like that which had formed the Prince-Bishoprics of Germany, the Papacy had gained possession of its states, and these now needed reconquest and consolidation. Sixtus IV. (†1484), like other Italian princes, pursued dynastic schemes for the benefit of his family; Alexander VI. (1492–1503), with the help of his son, Cesare Borgia, aimed further

at a re-establishment of the temporal power. Henceforth the Papacy had its own territorial interests to consider, and Italian politics brought it into rivalry with France, Germany, and Spain. At a time when the great nations were becoming strong and separate powers, with objects of their own, a great strain was thus put on the old ties of ecclesiastical unity. Forces of disunion were at work which the Middle Ages had developed but not brought to their fullest strength; the task of maintaining Christian unity was harder because the Papacy, hitherto its great and often unselfish guardian, had now territorial and dynastic interests of its own. These interests weighed strongly with Popes, secular rather than spiritual in tone, Italian in their diplomacy and state-craft.

The problem of the relations between the Papacy and the monarchies of Europe had already presented itself to the Middle Ages, and was for them identical with the relations of Church and State. But the great Councils of the West had brought into greater clearness a conception of an ecclesiastical unity distinct from Papal supremacy, a distinction which increased historical knowledge and study of primitive times was bound to emphasise. Each nation, moreover, had its own peculiar features. Germany had its Prince-Bishops, laymen in all but name, sprung as a matter of course from noble families, and involved in the dynastic and local feuds that abounded there, independent in most respects of Emperor or Pope. In Spain the Church was noted for the rigid and spiritual lives of its bishops, and had become closely bound up with the royal power, itself deeply religious in tone. In France the bishops

**The
Papacy
and the
European
States.**

were practically dependent upon the Crown; liberty from external meant subjection in internal control. In England strongly-expressed anti-Papal legislation was, as a rule, ineffective; theoretical anomalies in royal and Papal relations were disregarded. If the Papal jurisdiction was exercised in much the same way throughout Europe, these lesser differences ought not to be overlooked, and it should be borne in mind that the restraints placed by France and England upon Papal taxation over the clergy had led to increased demands upon Germany. That country had, therefore, a special interest in administrative reform. Many such questions of reform had been raised in the great Councils; but the Papacy, by its diplomacy, had evaded the demands and emerged from the struggle stronger than before. The Councils had failed to do what was needed and expected: men looked to the Papacy—the power which had overcome the Councils—to succeed where they had failed. But the Papacy had special objects of its own: the very concordats with England and Germany by which it had gained its victory, and the unsettled controversy on Gallican liberties, not only tied its hands, but also recognised the existence of national interests and division that worked against unity. The unity of the Western Church was threatened with inevitable dangers, made more acute by the condition of the Papacy itself. For the Papacy might indeed as before represent Western unity; but it did little to strengthen or even preserve it.

But there was a further cause of danger. The Middle Ages, strong in their institutions, regarding man

Growth of Individualism. as a member of a guild, a community, or a church, had tended to repress the individual. But now in politics and in trade, in life generally, individual character was asserting itself. The change in art was typical. The great artistic works had been up to now, and for the most part, buildings, expressions of a corporate life in which the artist's name and individuality were sunk; art now threw itself into channels where individual force and individual names were to be joined for ever. The founder, for instance, of a new order, the teacher in a university had been less than his order, less than his system. S. Dominic is for us the first of his order; S. Thomas Aquinas, the writer of the *Summa*; Wiclif, the almost impersonal head of a movement. In the newer age that was coming S. Ignatius Loyola is a personality that inspires his order; Erasmus and Luther are personalities above all else. The contrast carried itself into remoter corners; it was certain the life of the Church would be richer because more varied in its individual parts, but it would not be easy to balance claims of authority and individual freedom which the older world had hardly felt to conflict.

Much is often said of the moral disorders and licence, partly due to growing riches and changing tastes, that marked the fifteenth century. It was as easy to see the ecclesiastical abuses; tardy or even corrupt courts at Rome and elsewhere; excessive fees and corruption; vows made but disregarded; duties unperformed. The older monastic orders—themselves products of earlier reformations—did little to mend matters. The evidence for their widespread corruption is inconclusive, especially in England, but they no

longer served their original purposes. The average monastic life was not indeed impure but it was no longer strenuous, and new foundations were therefore few. The Mendicant Orders—Franciscans and Dominicans—had also, although to a smaller degree, grown cold from their first enthusiasm. It was felt that the exemptions from episcopal contact given so freely to monasteries and generally to the Friars had been unwise, and fresh powers of visitation were widely sought. Archbishop Warham in England (1511) and Cardinal Ximenes in Spain had exercised large powers of monastic visitation intended to quicken and reform religious life.

But the Church has never, even at its worst, rested content in face of moral or administrative evils: the quickening of life—always a strain and an effort—has always been marked by the bringing out from its treasuries of things new and old; sometimes it puts new life into old forms and institutions; sometimes it develops new organisations or new forms of devotion. All these features we can see in the years just before the sixteenth century; apart from “the Reformation in Head and Members” urged by the great Councils, mysticism, a deeper religious learning, new discipline of life, new forms of devotion, all bore witness to the reviving strength of the Church, and the new demands new needs made upon her. Pilgrimages, shrines, relics, had never been more highly regarded: some special cults (such as that of S. Anne) developed rapidly at the end of the fifteenth century; whatever is thought of their virtue in themselves, their popularity is a sign of devotional feeling. As significant, too, is the growth of religious literature in the popular

tongues, the revival of popular preaching. Nor was biblical study neglected; Gerson, the great theologian of France, wished to simplify theology upon this basis: in Germany theologians like John Wessel (1420–89) took the same line; the University of Erfurt (founded in 1392) was noted for its modern spirit and its biblical exegesis illustrated by Matthias Döering (†1469); no less than fourteen translations of the Bible into High German appeared before the days of Luther.

These attempts to remedy evils in life and to place theology in a fresh light both for study and teaching showed themselves in many ways in Germany; in the monastic and semi-monastic orders they led to a return to original rules and a stricter visitation of evils. Among the Benedictines John Busch, a monk near Bursfeld, organised the Lower Saxon convents and set up a type which was largely followed over a larger area; seventy-five foundations joined the Bursfeld congregation. Among the Franciscans a lapse from original ideals had brought on the struggle between the Conventuals (who had already adopted laxer rules and more settled homes) and the Observants (who desired a stricter observance of the Founder's life of poverty and alms): here, again, a reform took place. Diedrech Coelde, writer of a simple catechetical exposition of belief and duty, *The Mirror of the Christian*, and a well-known itinerant preacher, reorganised his order in North Holland, Belgium, and the Rhine district. The movement spread to the Augustinian Friars, first organised by Zolter (under Pius II. in 1438) and later by Andreas Proles, their Vicar-General (1473–1503). John von Staupitz, the teacher of Luther, carried on and ex-

tended the work. All these were monastic reformers—hating existing evils, inspired by the old monastic ideals, spending themselves in education and preaching, freely using the new ally of instruction, the printing-press—animated by a deep love of their Saviour often most touchingly expressed.

It was by an Italian continuation of this movement that (1504) the Italian Benedictines also were reorganised; that among the Camoldolites a separate and strictly ascetic congregation was formed; that Matteo de Bassi (1526) gathered the Capuchins—a strict section of Franciscans marked by their more Franciscan life and their pointed hood (*cappucino*). The last—a genuine revival of their order, both in their preaching and in their popular sympathies—did much for the Church, and became a separate order in 1619. Among some members of “The Oratory of Divine Love,” formed among the more religious Humanists at Rome (1523), arose the Order of Theatines (1524), named from the see (Theate) of a leading member, Caraffa, afterwards Paul IV. Caraffa’s sojourn in Spain and his tastes brought him into touch with the strictest Spanish theology and the stricter clerical life of the seculars; this element, combined with the better impulses of the Renaissance, were seen in the Theatines, who, as secular priests under monastic vows, devoted themselves mainly to preaching, care of the sick, pastoral duties generally, and the training of the clergy. Somewhat similar was the Order of the Barnabites (1530). But the rapid growth and great influence of the Jesuits—themselves a part of this widespread movement—overshadowed these earlier and lesser branches of it.

The work of the learned Cardinal Nicholas (Krebs), of Cusa, as Papal Legate in Germany (1451), was similar. A former advocate of the Conciliar theory, he now worked for the Papacy, whose power for reform was, at any rate, not exhausted, as was the Council's; from Salzburg to the Netherlands he journeyed, preaching with great effect, holding Synods (which were more frequent now), and visiting the monasteries. "He," says Trithemius (himself a worker of the same class), "appeared in Germany as an angel of light appears in the midst of darkness and confusion; he re-established the unity of the Church, strengthening the authority of the visible head, scattering abundant seeds of new life. . . . God was the starting-point of all his knowledge—the glory of God and the bettering of mankind the object of all his wisdom." We are too apt to consider the work of ecclesiastical and monastic discipline purely technical, but this new and firmer discipline enforced a high ideal where it was most needed on the priests and teachers of all; the restoration of monastic discipline meant not only the removal of scandals, but the increased efficiency of what were at once schools, religious communities, and the medieval counterparts of our religious societies.

Amid general tendencies and broad results isolated currents of thought can often be noticed. One such had **Mysticism**. existed in Germany in the School of Mystics, **Brethren of** necessarily more absorbed in the personal **the Common** than the social side of religion. But even **Life**. such influence joined with others to keep alive the ideal and the practice of the Church; they were in no sense heretical in doctrine, they were not

even anti-Papal in politics. Many of these influences were grouped around centres of that remarkable society the Brethren of the Common Life.

Founded by Gerhard Groot (about 1380 A.D.) with a simple and practical aim—the improvement of life and the work of education—the Brethren were afterwards organised upon a semi-monastic model. Their spread was rapid, and they soon became the leading influence in the Netherlands and North-West Germany. Copying of MSS., and later on the printing of books, were among their practical works; the love of classics and a sound religious tone were the chief marks of the education they gave. Not only the Bible, but the Fathers also, were the objects of their study: if some of their pupils equalled Italians in their learning, most of them surpassed the Italians in the purity of their lives. Germany, and not Italy, was the earlier field of the Renaissance; from 1456–1506 no less than nine universities were founded, and the movement there had an ethical and practical tone lacking in Italy. Of the German Renaissance the Brethren of the Common Life were, above all, the forerunners and the authors. Their history belongs to the century before the Reformation, but their importance is greatest in the Reformation period itself, for their labours began a movement sometimes called the Catholic Reformation, sometimes the Counter-Reformation, a movement too often regarded as a mere reaction against the Protestant Reformation, beginning only when that had spent its force. But a truer conception is to see the origin of both Protestant Reformation and Catholic Reformation (or Counter-Reformation) in a movement earlier than either, and containing the

germs of both. In that earlier movement the Brethren of the Common Life played a leading part.

The Revival of Learning—a phrase often used to imply more ignorance on the part of the Middle Ages than they possessed—was to a large extent a separate movement in Italy and Germany. In the former it was classical, artistic, and even pagan; in the latter it was practical and educational, allied to theology. In England, under Grocyn, Colet, and More, it was more akin to the German type. Under Nicholas V. the Renaissance captured the Papacy. The Curia—that group of officials who often bought their posts and lived on their fees, and whose interest lay in opposing reform—was now deeply tinged with the classical spirit, somewhat indeed with the pagan. Absorbed in its politics, affected mainly by the Italian side of Renaissance, the Papacy was out of touch with the better side of ecclesiastical life. It was a problem whether the energy and power of this great movement could be controlled and guided by the Church. Julius II. saw the problem, and so far as art and architecture went, he solved it. But other Popes hardly saw the difficulty or the chance, and the merits of Leo X. have often been exaggerated in this direction. The failure of the Conciliar movement had left the Papacy the guardian of the Church's unity, the official leader of any possible reform. But it was not to be until well into the sixteenth century that it rose to the height of its work. Hence it was that a man like Erasmus, the product of the early German movement for reform, was in imperfect sympathy with the Papacy itself while an advocate of all that the Papacy stood for.

In Spain no less than in Germany the Church had

passed through a critical time. The constant presence of the Moors, the seeming need of a crusade against these tangible enemies of the Cross, had given Spanish Christianity a character of its own—serene, lofty, enthusiastic on the one hand, but self-absorbed and intolerant on the other. Circumstances had led to a closer union of Church and State than was found elsewhere. The relations with the Papacy were regulated by the Concordat of 1482, by which the Crown gained the nomination to bishoprics converted under Adrian VI. into the right of presentation. The royal right of “Placet,” together with the anti-Papal enactments of the Cortes, had limited (much as in England) Papal jurisdiction and taxation. The Inquisition had been set up in Castile and Arragon (in the former of which it was more popular than in the latter) in November, 1477. Twenty years later the right of appeal from it to the Pope was done away with, and henceforth it was an instrument of civil government at times too strong for the power controlling it. The Papacy was ready to restrain its powers, as desired to do by the Cortes of Arragon under Charles V., had not the King protested. Where the royal power was so great many rulers would have used the Church purely for their own political ends. It was the peculiarity of “the Catholic sovereigns,” as they well deserved to be called, to place before themselves a high religious ideal. Queen Isabella found a strenuous fellow-worker in Cardinal Ximenes, a strict Franciscan and her confessor since 1492. In 1495 he was raised to the rich and important archbishopric of Toledo, although less aristocratic than his predecessors. He carried on both among regulars and

**Cardinal
Ximenes.**

seculars a work of reform. Strict monastic visitations and the appointment to high offices and bishoprics of men of only the highest character changed the ecclesiastical tone of the country. And with him learning as well as piety was essential. His own foundation, the University of Alcalá, produced the Complutensian Polyglot, and its biblical studies were as famous as the scholastic attainments of its older rival, Salamanca. At the latter university the influence of Aquinas was supreme, and hence Spanish theologians gained a reputation for depth and conservatism, joined to a high level of life. It should be set against the cruelty of the Inquisition that under Ximenes it was used to enforce upon the clergy a rigorous purity and zeal.

If, then, the evils from which the Church suffered were great, it was something that they were admitted and that their removal had been attempted. Means of reform—local movements of reform in varied directions—were at hand to help a general movement. Higher ideals of life, new heights of learning, had been held up to the expiring Middle Ages. It was important for the world, when political causes and jealousies—national and dynastic—were rending it, to realise its ecclesiastical and spiritual unity. But new forms of life, new currents of thought, are hard to control. And the future of Europe, at any rate, depended upon the spirit and vigour in which the Church approached her task. Signs of danger and of promise were strangely mingled. Would the leaders of the Church have the sagacity to see them both? Would they have the power and the courage to seize the one and escape the other?

CHAPTER II

THE PAPACY AND THE LATERAN COUNCIL

ON August 18th, 1503, Alexander VI. (Borgia) died, to the unspeakable joy of all Rome, it was said. Even he had acknowledged, somewhat tardily, the need for reform in discipline, although his great aim had been to consolidate the states of the Church. A commission had been appointed to consider what was needed, and it had reported (1597)—sales of benefices were to be prohibited, pluralities, even if held by Cardinals, to be restricted. This impulse to better things, however, soon passed away in the stress of politics and dynastic projects. The Conclave that followed his death—divided into French, Italian, and Spanish parties—compromised by the election of Pius III. (Cardinal Piccolomini, a nephew of Pius II.), worthy in character but aged and sickly. Wide reform and a council were promised. The Archbishop of Mainz formulated the needs of Germany, which, repeated in 1457, 1510, and 1522, may be summarised as mainly reforms in Papal relations, ecclesiastical finance and patronage. But these hopes were ended by the new Pope's death (October 18th). On All Saints' Day (1503) Julius Rovere succeeded and became Julius II. His Papacy (1503-13) was filled by Italian wars, in

Julius II.,
1503.

which as a patriot and even as a soldier the Pope played a leading part. By the League of Cambrai, formed against Venice (1508), he gained for the Papacy Ravenna (that old rival of Rome), Rimini, and Faenza; by the Holy League, formed against France by him with Venice, Spain, and England (1511), he further gained Parma and Piacenza. Thus he consolidated the temporal power. Criticism, both then and since, has dealt severely with the warfare and diplomacy that gained his end. That end was frankly secular; indeed, the most spiritual feature of Julius was his grand and deliberate employment of art at its best. But without the Papal States the Pope would have been undoubtedly weaker; the absence of possessions does not always imply freedom from cares, nor the lack of temporalities a gain of spirituality. For Italian politics the Papal States were a necessity; their existence caused no more scandal than the possession by a bishop of lands or fiefs. Claims to these territories, variously founded and not always enforced, had been acquired by a process centuries long. But when gained the territories had been ruled more as estates or fiefs than as an ordered State; vassals inside and outside had held the real power, and it was not until the days of Julius II. that the Papacy really ruled in its own territory. When churchmen elsewhere were striving at high moral aims, the secure acquisition, or even the peaceful ordering of territory seemed a poor ideal by comparison. But this policy gave the Papacy a sure footing in Italy, without which its influence at this time would have been small. Italian sympathy went with Julius; his policy was manly and respectable,

even if his warfare was unsuited to a Pope. At any rate, the Papacy was now a power to be reckoned with in politics, and in Italian politics it was of the first importance.

There was here nothing very lofty, such could hardly be looked for from Julius' character, but his edict against simony in Papal elections, published on his accession and further recommended to the Cardinals on his death-bed, was a sign of better days.

Lewis XII. of France, "the eldest son of the Church," when annoyed by Papal policy could retaliate upon the Pope by exchanging spheres of action. **Anti-Papal** Attacked by the Pope in politics he could **Policy of** reply in spiritual matters. A French Synod **Lewis XII.** called (September 14th, 1510) at Tours condemned upon formal interrogation the Pope's action, affirmed the King's right to defend himself even by withdrawing his obedience, and appealed for justice to a General Council. Next year, in the midst of these political difficulties and of a campaign where Julius commanded in person, five discontented Cardinals, headed by the Spaniard Carvajal, called a Council at Pisa for September 1st. The Pope's reply was to fulfil tardily his earlier promise by summoning a General Council to meet at the Lateran on April 19th, 1512.

Its objects were to extinguish schism, reform the Church, and arrange a crusade against the Turks, a constant danger to Europe. But taken as a reply to Lewis this summons lost much of its grace and power. The obedience of other sovereigns was not too certain. Maximilian in Germany had not only assumed the title of Emperor, although not crowned by the Pope,

but amid his countless plans had even dreamt of becoming Pope as well as Emperor. And Diet after Diet had placed ecclesiastical reform among the first necessities of the Empire.

Maximilian sought advice at this time from the great Heidelberg scholar Wimpfeling. The Emperor had thought of introducing a Pragmatic Sanction as in France (by which his jurisdiction and right of nomination to offices would be secured), of appropriating the annates (here following Spanish precedents), and, lastly, of obtaining practical independence for the Church in Germany under the guidance of a permanent Legate with the fullest power. Wimpfeling's advice was to proceed by reforming the financial and judicial relations between Germany and the Curia rather than by such radical changes as suggested. The evils he named had been complained of in 1457, and were to appear in German *gravamina* again and again before their final appearance at Trent in 1561. The greater freedom of France and England had increased the Papal demands upon Germany, and the failure of all reforms in her politics threw stress upon the needed ecclesiastical reforms.

The attempted Council at Pisa fell somewhat flat, in spite of lukewarm support from France. The Council called by Julius, on the other hand, was slightly postponed by some French successes, but at length was opened on May 3rd (1512) with an eloquent sermon by Egidius of Viterbo on the need of reform and a Turkish crusade. In the earlier sessions little was done except to declare its rival at Pisa schismatic, and a prorogation to November 3rd took place. By

that time Maximilian had given his adhesion to the Lateran assembly, and sent Duke George of Saxony to urge reform. The delicate question of the French Pragmatic Sanction had also been begun, but affairs moved slowly. On February 20th, 1513, Julius died.

The new Pope, Leo X.—Giovanni, son of Lorenzo the Magnificent—was an Italian, skilled in politics, but lacking the restless energy and force of Julius II.; in himself he was a child of the Renaissance with all its love of ease and beauty, but his official patronage of art and literature was slight and ineffective. For a time the wars of the Allies against France lingered on, but if the aims of Julius, now the aims of Leo also, were to be reached, and a schism to be avoided, peace had to be made. The schismatic cardinals were pardoned, and (December 19th, 1513) the submission of France to the Council received. The easy schism thus easily reconciled, questions of doctrine came up for discussion, and the philosophic crudities of Italian philosophers led to a decree against deniers of the soul's immortality. The committee appointed to prepare a scheme of reform reported, but mainly in general terms; there were no adequate attempts to meet the reasonable complaints of Germany and France; the restrictions now placed on pluralities could be easily evaded (May, 1514). Next year a decree limited exemptions from episcopal control; yearly visitations of convents so exempted were to be made by the diocesan.

Another decree ordered that all cases concerning benefices (except those reserved by the Pope) should, in the first instance, come before the bishop.

A third decree, in the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, placed the control of all printing-presses in the hands of the bishops.

The ideal of the assembly was thus seen to be not new legislation, but the enforcement of old rules—one most useful decree was that which insisted upon the frequent meeting of Synods—a feature of Church life which had shown itself in every period of mediæval reform, and was specially marked in Spain and Germany at this time. More, however, had been looked for from the Council, and had it not been for the opposition, hardly restrained by the Pope, between cardinals and bishops, more might have been gained. Against the Curia the bishops were powerless, but against their old foes—monks and friars—they gained more control both over their monasteries internally and over their preaching outside. The weight attached to the Council as a whole was seen when the tax upon the clergy voted for the crusade was not paid either by Spain, or by Germany; they waited until they saw the war actually begun.

The repudiation of the Pragmatic Sanction and the confirmation by the Council of the Concordat of Bologna between Leo and Francis I. was less a gain to the Church than to the Papacy. For the Pope regained the annates, but the right of nominating to bishoprics and other dignities fell to the King; the old Gallican liberties so closely bound up with the Conciliar theory were, however, abandoned, and this was in principle and for the time a victory for the Pope.

When the Council, which had never numbered much more than one hundred cardinals and bishops, was dis-

solved (March 16, 1517) its actual accomplishments were smaller than its significance. It had been the genuine outcome of the two leading factors in the Church politics of the time—a wide and deep wish for reform, and the more secular needs of the Papacy. The Papacy had for many years gathered to itself nearly all ecclesiastical power; it had directed nearly all ecclesiastical work; men looked to it to undertake the pressing need of reform, but this was beyond its power and outside its wish. The Council was ready to undertake the work, but it split on the rock of opposition between the Curia and the Bishops—an opposition that was to grow even stronger by the Council of Trent. The one fact that did come out more clearly than ever was the power of the Pope. He was “as a second God upon earth,” said one bishop. The high Papal theory had never been more boldly stated than by the learned Thomas de Vio (Cardinal Cajetan), General of the Dominicans, in a sermon at the second Session (May, 1512). But as yet the Papacy had not risen to the call made upon it, and was led rather by minor considerations than by religious impulse or principle. There was a divergence, more marked as the century went on, between this exaltation of Papal power and this demand for reform which the Papacy had so far failed to meet. While the Western Church, however, had thus shown its needs and wishes, its ruling theory and its lack of power, political combinations and new social developments were changing everything. The rulers of the West—like the Popes themselves—found motives more inspiring than their unity or religious faith. The Turk, who had crushed the Christianity of

The
Lateran
Council.

the East, was thundering at the gate of the West; revolution, to gather force from political anarchy and social change, was at hand. Germany, more than all States bound up with Italy and with Rome, more open than all States to the disorders of Church life, was to be its seat.

CHAPTER III

GERMANY AND THE REFORMATION UP TO 1529

CHURCH life in Germany early in the sixteenth century had marked features of its own; nowhere were the higher offices of more political importance and more secular in administration. At a date little later a Bavarian prince was Archbishop of Köln and held four other sees without being in priest's orders. Less striking cases of the same aristocratic abuse were common. The princes to whose families this abuse was due were, moreover, drawing all power into their own hands. Beneath all this there lay, however, both the revival of learning with its great schools at Deventer, Schletstadt, and elsewhere, and also the deep movement towards a higher life among the Brethren of the Common Life, the Benedictines, Augustinian Friars, and others. Under better political circumstances, and with effective national institutions, these movements would have been more effective; in the fight of emperor, princes, cities, and peasants they lost much of their force. A more efficient Church unity—such as a strong and unselfish Papacy would have directed—might have saved them; but it was

**Germany
at the
Beginning
of the
Sixteenth
Century.**

here—in the relations of Papacy and the German Church—that most faults had been already laid bare.

The Humanist movement in Germany was (as said before) mainly Christian in tone and, above all, educational. Intercourse with Italian Humanists could not fail to bring in other and more pagan elements, and a fresh cause of discord between the Humanists and leading churchmen had arisen. Reuchlin, the greatest of German scholars, not content with Latin and Greek, turned to Hebrew, and on the possible use of Jewish literature, a quarrel began between him and the Dominicans. A converted Jew, Pfefferkorn, wished to destroy all Jewish books, and the Dominicans of Köln, especially the Inquisitor-General, Jacob Hochstraten, agreed with him. Reuchlin took the wiser side of tolerance; the strife soon became of literary, theological, and even of political importance. From a summons to appear before the Inquisition at Mainz, Reuchlin appealed to Leo X. (1513). A Papal commission (July, 1516) sympathised with the new learning, and acquitted him of heresy; but Leo, preferring personal peace to action, put off his own decision.

In Germany, however, the whole strength of learning had been thrown on the side of Reuchlin; the opponents, the reactionary party—which in ecclesiastical matters so often claims to represent traditions greater and better than its principles—had been consolidated; parties were strongly marked. When Leo (June, 1520) gave his decision, condemning Reuchlin's book, the *Augenspiegel*, the theological significance of the struggle was exhausted; but its literary and scholastic significance remained. Ulrich von Hutten, a knight, and there-

fore sharing the national feelings of that most important German class, a scholar whose patriotism was only heightened by his study of ancient life, had mocked the timid scholars of Köln in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, written by him along with Crotus Rubianus and others. Hutten had previously satirised Julius II. and the Papal Court; the struggle about Reuchlin threw the main literary strength of Germany on the same anti-Papal side, where much of its political strength had long been gathering.

The greatest name in Germany and far beyond it was that of Erasmus. Born at Rotterdam about 1466, he was educated partly at Deventer, partly at Herzogenbusch, in schools of the Common Life. Here he received the best education the dying Medieval world could give, tinged by classical learning, directed towards the study of MSS. of the Fathers of the Bible. Thus his youth was passed among the reforming and creative influences already noted. At an early date he received from a comrade his first impulse to the study of Jerome, the Father who was his model and his type. In 1486 he made his profession as a regular in the Augustinian Monastery of Stein, but his tastes were those of a scholar, and for a scholar travel was essential. In 1496 we find him, a priest of four years' standing, at the University of Paris. Thus he started on his life, emphatically that of a cosmopolitan scholar at home wherever learning was to be found, and in his own case, since his birthplace was amid the shifty politics of the Netherlands, with no patriotism to counteract the wider tastes. Visits to England brought him into touch with Colet—a deeply religious teacher at Oxford and as Dean of St. Paul's—

Erasmus,
1466-1536.

and with Sir Thomas More, the typical scholar of England, akin to Germany rather than to Italy in his tastes. But the influence of these two characters upon him has often been over-estimated, for before he knew them he had received the best impulses of his life and laid down the lines of his future theology.

Residence at Oxford and Cambridge (where he was Professor of Divinity) gave him further chances of influencing others. In 1507 he visited Italy, and was tempted to settle at Rome, an image of the world in miniature, and after many movements between the Netherlands and England he at last (1521) settled down at Basel, his headquarters since 1514. Of his many works, his *Colloquies* (Latin conversations on topics mainly ecclesiastical and moral) and his *Praise of Folly* were, and are still, the most popular. Their humour is modern in its type and its delicacy of touch. All the contradictions, the coarseness, the abuses, and the ignorance of the Medieval world come under the lash of his satire. He did not spare the monks to whom his old teachers of the Common Life stood in hostility; he did not spare the abuses of administration, the excrescences of devotion (such as the exaggerations of pilgrimages and relics), and the moral shortcomings so freely pointed out by others. But it was the distortions and not the spirit of Medieval Christianity that he assaulted. On the positive side his New Testament with paraphrases (1516), his editions of Jerome, Cyprian, Augustine, and part of Athanasius were great achievements, illustrating the theological and educational instincts, at times also the critical deficiencies, of the German Renaissance. In details his critical work might be at fault, but the impulse and

the spirit were sound. "Good letters," a learned theology, were to be the foundations of the Reformation he wished to see. His whole ideal was based on Church unity, which was indeed another and a higher aspect of the common brotherhood of learning, for him his very fatherland and home. It is significant how all the movements of reform in various countries gather round him—in England, France, and Spain all look to him and depend upon his letters. Those, on the other hand, who distrusted the expansive spirit of learning instinctively opposed him, and in each of these lands he had controversies upon his hands. He represents at their strongest and best those earlier movements whose influences we have seen. Amid the events that were soon to happen this mental attitude seemed to hold him aloof from revolution and reaction alike. It was due to something more deeply rooted than either a timid disposition or his criticism of Luther's acts. Driven from Basel by the Reformation, he significantly passed to Freiburg in Breisgau, a quiet home of learning. His name was almost obscured by that of Luther, and as, in spite of pressure from Louvain, he kept his former paths he was blamed for timidity or half-hearted zeal.

Martin Luther, the son of a Saxon peasant and with the strong, thorough Saxon temperament, had joined the Augustinian Friars at Erfurt; there he came under the influence of the monastic reform which Proles began and von Staupitz carried on. In his visitations as vicar von Staupitz became a spiritual guide to Luther, whose deep sense of sin and rigid performance of duties were strongly

**His
relation to
Reform.**

**Martin
Luther.**

marked; by the vicar's advice he turned himself to biblical study, the special characteristic of Erfurt. The Elector Frederic the Wise had founded (1502) a university at Wittenberg, which was from the first the home of Humanism, and in the management of which Staupitz had a great share. To this university Luther was called (1508); he visited Rome (1510) on business for his Order, and saw in Italy not only the abuses he knew in Germany, but also an absorption in politics with a more pagan form of scholarship and even life. On his return he took his Doctor's degree, and began to lecture and preach, while still keeping up his biblical studies. In these years he came under the influence of the mystic theologians, the school to which Tauler, whose sermons he praised, and to whom he attributed the *Deutsche Theologie*, afterwards edited by him.

In the Middle Ages, as at all times, popular theology had on many points outrun authorised theology: the fifteenth century was overladen both in bold speculations and practical details by the results of past generations. There were many matters in which a large and fluctuating body of fluid opinions and varying practices had gathered round a small nucleus of admitted truth. This was notably the case with the doctrine of Indulgences. The Church as a body, with a discipline of its own, had the power of imposing external penalties for sin, but to ensure forgiveness contrition was needed in addition to this penalty: furthermore, since the Church was a divine body the performance or the neglect of any duty prescribed by it had a real bearing upon the spiritual life. The custom had grown up—purely as a matter of practice—of granting an indulgence or

**Popular
Theology.**

remission of these external penalties on account of some special act of faith or charity duly performed. In the Ely Registers of John de Fordham (1388-1426), for instance, there are numerous entries of Indulgences mainly for works of charity: repairs of roads, support of the blind, of hermits, and of pilgrims, maintenance of chapels, making good losses by fire, release of captives, prayers for the success of the King in the Welsh war (1405), prayers for the dead, and so on. The tendency in later years was for the granting of these Indulgences to pass more and more into the hands of the Pope, in this respect as in others episcopal power being weakened. But in any case the process meant the substitution by some authority representing the Church of a general act of penance for a number of varied acts prescribed in separate cases by an inferior authority.

All this, however, related solely to the outward act of penance. As public penance had become rarer, and sacramental confession laid stress on its other elements—the confession and absolu-
In-
dulgences.
tion—the act of penance had become more and more nominal, more like the ordinary fines of civil life as tabulated in Medieval codes. The conception of fines, in short, devoted to religious or ecclesiastical objects grew up, and was extended by the system of Indulgences, reckoned for so many years in proportion to the amount. But with the vivid Medieval notion of Purgatory, the expression (say) of an Indulgence for a hundred years (originally only a measure of scale) was open to misconstruction, and in the hands of ecclesiastical rulers not specially spiritual in mind the system itself was open to abuse. From a war against

the Turks the objects multiplied until (1509) Julius II. issued an Indulgence for the rebuilding of S. Peter's.

But this simpler aspect of indulgences—which however open to abuse did yet emphasise both the idea of sin, and also the fact that all sin is no merely private matter, but concerns the Church—was complicated by another doctrine, that of the Treasure of the Church, its accumulation of prayers and blessings: a complex subject upon which Medieval thinkers had speculated widely. More and more the control of Indulgences, the assumed power to use the Treasure of the Church, had passed from the episcopate to the Popes. Indulgences were a form of Papal income, and as such at times opposed by jealous sovereigns: they, like other branches of Papal income, were often condemned both by isolated thinkers and popular opinion; the “questers,” or preachers of Indulgences were often hated and despised, even where freely encouraged in their trade.

This doctrine and practice of Indulgence is specially hard for us to estimate fairly; speculation and discussion were still at work upon it; both its scientific and its popular expression were tinged by the ecclesiastical, legal, and social ideas of the day. In practice it touched on the one side the power and finances of the Curia: on the other the defective clerical discipline and the lax moral sense of the day. Indulgences had caused discussion both on the scholastic and the practical side: doctrinally they needed definition, practically they needed reform. Efforts after a stricter monastic and clerical discipline, the study of theology on a more biblical basis, would make these needs more apparent; both these elements were found in the

Saxon Augustinians under Staupitz; a keen personal sense of sin, and the apprehension of a living Saviour, would deepen the sense of abuse: both these feelings were found in Luther.

The charge of the Indulgence issued by Leo X. for the rebuilding of S. Peter's was given along with half the proceeds in his provinces of Mainz and Luther's Magdeburg to Archbishop Albert of Bran- theses. denburg; he could thus recoup himself for a gift to Leo which had gained him the See of Mainz. For political reasons the Elector of Saxony did not allow Tetzel the Commissioner to preach it in his land, but he visited the neighbouring places. Already a visitation of the Augustinian convents of Saxony (when he was deputy for Staupitz) had convinced Luther as to the need of a reform of discipline: already he had studied the Pauline epistles with their insistence upon justification by faith, and lectured upon them (1516). From this standpoint, and also as a teacher who dealt with practical questions and knew the views of the common man, Luther was bound to oppose this development of Indulgences. But the method of his opposition was academic and Medieval; he fastened ninety-five theses, or subjects for argument, to the door of the Castle Church. While he laid stress upon the spiritual process of repentance, Luther proposed, by the Medieval process of disputation, to discuss the kernel of accepted doctrine apart from accretions of opinion or unhealthy practice: he wished to ascertain the true teaching of the Church: from the Bishop of Brandenburg, his ordinary, to whom he wrote, he received a reply approving his views, but advising silence. Luther had

no doubt but that the Pope would equally be on his side.

The area of the discussion widened: University opinion had then more interest for princes and populace than it has often had since. Political causes intensified its tone, and it ceased to be a mere search after truth. The Elector Frederick, from jealousy of the House of Brandenburg, would naturally defend Luther: others from interested motives would attack him. Public and academic opinion was already excited not only by the Reuchlin discussion, but by the demands for Church reform, in Germany a question of politics. Tetzl, naturally concerned, took up the opposition; his fellow Dominicans, still sore from the Reuchlin incident, sided with him. Against Luther's theological grounds stress was laid upon the power of the Pope and ecclesiastical order. Not only Hochstraten the Inquisitor, but a Dominican in higher place—Silvester Mazzolini (Prierias), Master of the Palace to the Pope, and a learned commentator upon Aquinas—issued a reply. The Universal Church was in practice the Roman Church: the Roman Church was in practice the Pope: the custom of the Church was as binding as law, and any doubt upon it was heresy. Ground was thus deliberately chosen upon which no distinction of doctrines, customs, or authority could be admitted. In his replies (some of which were, like other pamphlets of the day, coarse in tone), Luther was led on to draw distinctions as to Papal power, and the doctrine of the Church and S. Thomas Aquinas. But he was still ready to submit to the decision of the Pope, and he had no doubt what that must be.

Although called to Rome (July, 1518), it was finally

arranged Luther should appear instead before the Legate Cardinal Cajetan at the Augsburg Diet **Luther and** (September). Thos. de Vio (Cajetan) was **Cajetan,** the Dominican whose sermon at the Lateran **1518.**

Council had so strongly set forth the Curialist ideal of the Papal power. His learning was undoubted; he was far from accepting the vulgar view of Indulgences, but his first anxiety was to silence the controversy that had arisen. He and Luther went some way towards meeting each other, but they started from opposite points: it was hard to reconcile authority stretched to cover existing customs, and faith stretched to cover insubordination. The interview ended in Luther's appeal to the Pope better informed, afterwards enlarged to an appeal from the Pope to a Council.

The question had now grown larger. Luther had in his favour his own personal vigour and force, backed by the growing school of Wittenberg, by the Scotist idealist reaction against the Thomist theology, by the national feeling of Germans against the Papacy. But the Embassy of Miltitz, wisely chosen by the Pope as both a diplomatist and a Saxon, seemed likely to compose the strife even at this later stage (December, 1518). Luther was ready to admit the use, within limits, of Indulgences, and the need of unity along with respect for Papal commands: he would keep silence if his antagonists did the same. From Miltitz he gathered that the abuses he had attacked were not likely to be maintained by the Papal Court. It mattered little that the decretal of Leo X., borne by Miltitz, stated as a minimum the doctrine of S. Thomas, although not exactly the doctrine of Tetzel (who was now, indeed, in disgrace): by the power of

the keys the sacrament of penance removed the guilt of sin, and the Indulgence, by using the Treasure of the Church, could remove its temporal punishment: the Pope could, by the means of prayer (*per modum suffragii*), transfer an Indulgence to souls in Purgatory. Silence upon these lines was certainly possible, had not the Leipzig disputation (June, 1519) raised wider issues.

John of Eck (Maier), of Ingolstadt, had grown from a youthful prodigy into a scholastic gladiator, and was eager for distinction: Carlstadt, a former colleague of Luther's, ill-balanced in mind, and in the end a preacher of revolution, was equally eager to state his views. A literary dispute between the two arose (May, 1518), and Luther, who arranged a personal discussion between them at Leipzig (June 27th, 1519), was in the end drawn into it himself. Directly challenged upon the primacy of the Pope and the Roman See, he was led on to express views of it labelled by his opponents as Hussite, and later on owned as such by himself. It is hard to give blame to either party for breaking the truce, but Luther, as the leader and as personally pledged, had to bear the most of it: the negotiations, complicated and unsatisfactory, were at an end: Luther had taken up a new position, and the quarrel had passed into its second stage. His language was not at all times consistent, and the point had been raised more by his adversaries than by himself. But it was to be the controversy of the time, and Luther—a man of impulse and instinct rather than reflection and insight—now threw himself into it heart and soul. He had not faced the question previously, but when

he did so, he found that unexpected logical results were needed by his position.

Other theologians or writers—Wiclif in England and Gregory of Heimburg, in Germany, for instance, had reached the same position, but nothing of importance came from their assertions. **Influences in favour of Luther.** Luther's fate differed from theirs, mainly because of the altered times and the political circumstances of Germany. There was an admitted need of reform, political and ecclesiastical, there were difficult and strained relations between Emperor, Pope, and Princes; above all, there was a ferment of thought which led parties readily to crystallise around a nucleus of definite assertion. The Papal Nuncio Aleander said (1521) that the priests joined in Luther's revolt, not for his sake, but from hatred of Rome; five years before this he had heard from many Germans that they were only waiting for some foolish man to give the signal by opening his mouth against Rome. Luther also drew to himself some of the Hussite feeling never wholly dead: something, too, of the old Conciliar sympathies went out towards him, at any rate in the earlier stages of his influence. The doctrine of Wiclif, carried to the young University of Prague, had become the watchword of the Bohemian nationalists eager to oppose the encroaching German influence. The death of Huss—whose leading works were bare literal copies of Wiclif's—had been followed by long wars, settled in outward form by the Council of Basel. The compromise by which communion in both kinds was allowed to the Bohemians had never been sanctioned by the Popes, but this outward mark of difference still continued, and its more

extended use was urged later at Trent both by the Emperor Ferdinand and the French ambassadors. Thus the memory of a revolt against Papal authority joined to doctrinal heresy was still kept alive; the printing-press by publishing some of Huss's works about this time brought his views forward still more. At Erfurt, too, where Luther had been trained, the Conciliar theory of Church politics survived. In many ways, then, a movement which was anti-Papal could depend upon a sympathy more widely spread than could one which was purely doctrinal or reformatory.

But it was more important that he also gathered around himself the growing national feeling: a typical German in virtues as in failings, in his hearty sincerity as in his frequent coarseness and blunt independence, he now stood as a representative of his nation in a struggle where more than academic and clerical interests were involved. His great writings of 1520—his *Address to the nobility of the German nation* and his *Babylonian Captivity*—showed him to be every inch a popular leader: the knights led by Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen, freelances, one in letters and the other in the field, took up his cause; in the tangled state of politics he was a useful ally for some who did not share his opinions; the Bull of condemnation (June 15th, 1520) brought to Germany by Eck met with little support: it was easy for a territorial prince to shelter a subject in even greater dangers, and Frederic the Wise was not likely to give up a professor of his favoured University. He urged further consideration upon the Pope, while Luther himself grew bolder and bolder, until at the end of 1520 he burnt the Papal bull.

**German
National
Feeling.**

In January, 1521, the Diet of Worms met under the new Emperor Charles V. in person: his election (June 28th, 1519) had been carried against the French party and had not been welcome to the Pope. As the ruler of Spain and the Netherlands he had other interests than those of Germany alone to consider. The Spanish influences of his youth (although he was brought up in the Netherlands) had given him an ideal of a church reformed after the Spanish model—righteous and disciplined, but under the control of the State, and at times not shrinking from an anti-Papal policy. His religious principles were the real guide of his life, but the needs of his scattered and discordant realms and the constant poverty of his means made him less effective for good than with more power he would have been. Leo dreading lest Charles, master of Naples as he was, should become too powerful an Emperor, had supported the election of Francis I. of France. Remembering this Charles's advisers were willing to favour Luther in order to embarrass the Pope: not only they, but Aleander also saw Luther's importance.

**The Diet
of Worms,
1521.**

In April Luther appeared before the Diet, and was asked whether he were willing to withdraw his works: after a day's consideration he refused unless convinced from Scripture of their falsehood. This was a formal defiance of the Church, for to neither Pope nor Council would he now submit: the fallibility of Councils he indeed expressly asserted. Negotiations, with little result, delayed the climax until (May, 1521) by the authority of the Emperor, though against the wish of some Electors, Luther was put under the ban of the

Emperor: his teaching was to be suppressed, and his books destroyed (Edict of Worms). It was significant that this condemnation was held more really important than that by the Pope. This very Diet, however, had presented to the Emperor Wimpfeling's old list of complaints against the Curia, dealing mainly with fees, patronage, and conflicts of jurisdiction; at its close the Archbishop of Mainz wrote to the Pope that the number of Lutherans was increased, few laymen sided with the clergy, the majority even of priests were ashamed to support the Roman Church, "so hateful was the name of the Roman Curia and the Papal decrees."

Thus a movement not more formidable at first than others of no permanent effect had by the circumstances of its origin and the manner in which it was met become of the greatest moment. The incident could not, as Leo blind to its gravity had hoped, be speedily closed. The Emperor, a good Catholic as he asserted, devout and orthodox in doctrine as were his Spanish subjects, might have small sympathy with Luther, although his advisers saw possible political uses for this bold heretic. In religion the Emperor and Pope were drawn together: politics had thrown them together also, and Milan (November 19th, 1521) had been seized by their allied armies. England, too, rising under Wolsey's guidance to a great position in Europe, was in their alliance. At this very time, however, Leo died (December 1st, 1521), but not before he had heard the reward of his alliance—the recovery of Parma and Piacenza for his dominions. But the crisis in Germany, quieted only for a time, outweighed this purely territorial gain.

On January 9th, 1522, Adrian of Utrecht, formerly tutor to the Emperor and now his Viceroy in Spain, was elected Pope, since neither French nor Spanish could carry their candidates. A **Adrian VI., 1522.** native of Utrecht, educated in schools of the Common Life, he had been a teacher of theology at Louvain; he was now Bishop of Tortosa and a Cardinal of four years' standing, but with few Roman interests: as a politician no less than as a man he was righteous and diligent, but ineffective: his piety and learning were undoubted, but more was required of a Pope at this crisis. He had been Grand Inquisitor in Spain, head of the office which the Cortes of Arragon would have persuaded the Pope to restrain had not Charles interfered. The Inquisition had therefore remained as an organ of royal influence and Church reform; if it had no sympathy with the newer thought of the day, it had a keen interest in clerical discipline. The same might be looked for from the next Pope. But his treatment of Luther would probably be stricter than Leo's had been; theology was to him a matter of vital importance.

One of Adrian's first acts was significant. Erasmus—the type of a reformer bent on divine learning, eager to repress evil in high and low, broad in sympathy but orthodox in theology, **Erasmus.** with a zeal for unity as fervent as that of S. Paul himself—was asked to Rome. It is characteristic of the way in which parties overlapped and yet were distinctly forming that Erasmus was suspected of writing both Henry VIII.'s attack upon Luther and Luther's reply. The immediate result of "the Lutheran tragedy" was that those who put unity before reform

began to dread reform itself: that many of those who hoped for reform began to think it incompatible with unity. The cause of unity was thus weighted by mistaken advocates with that of abuses: the cause of reform was equally wrongly weighted with that of revolution. It is easy for mistaken men of thought or action to prejudice great issues in such a way. But Erasmus was one who kept his head clear amid strife and discord: the accession of Adrian seemed to promise a reform furthered by the guardian of Western unity, the Pope himself. He refused Adrian's invitation to Rome, but stated his views of what was needed. A Council must meet: everyone must give up something for the common good. The evil had gone too far for burning or amputation. To consider these questions there should be called from every country men of unsullied integrity, grave, mild, gracious, and without passion, whose opinions—and here the letter breaks off, a tempting field for conjecture.

But two elements of opposition very near the Papacy had to be reckoned with—the officials of the Curia dependent upon offices bought, in many cases, for large sums, and the extreme conservative theologians alarmed at the spread of a new learning they did not sympathise with and a criticism they held dangerous. The one deprecated change in the central administration, the other needed but to see a doctrine or practice attacked to become convinced of its necessity to guard more fundamental points. The former party naturally had its stronghold at Rome; the latter in the Sorbonne, at Louvain, Ingoldstadt, and Köln. In theological matters they could also depend upon Spanish ecclesiastics, but in matters of discipline the

Spaniards, trained up under a strict system themselves, wished to see the same everywhere enforced.

The new Pope declared Luther's opinions insipid and unreasonable; he saw, however, how much support they had gained from unchecked abuses **Adrian and Re-** and political interests involved. He at **form.** once addressed himself, therefore, to the most urgent questions of practice and manners. First he took up the question of Indulgences and the administration of the Curia.

He desired a return to a more primitive discipline of penance, which would restore Indulgences to their former place, and lay stress upon two elements—the inward feeling of the penitent, and the service done to the Church by the deed of penance or the money equivalent paid for the Indulgences. But an objection was made by some of the Curia that any regulation of the subject might be regarded as a confession of error in the face of criticism, and so the unregulated opinions and the practical abuses were left undealt with. The officials, however, were charged to be more sparing and cautious in their issue of indulgences. Unsuccessful here, Adrian next turned to dispensations, especially in cases of marriage. Here, again, the interests of officials who had bought their offices and depended upon the fees were concerned. This influence was powerful enough to stay reform, but the Pope insisted upon care in the issue of dispensations, and also by a decree made void all reservations to benefices and dignities granted since 1484. At home among theologians and in the ecclesiastical atmosphere of Spain—although even there he had not been very successful in his dealings with men and worldly forces—Adrian was out

of sympathy with the Roman Court, and failed to understand its delicate politics. The interests of Italy, he was told, made the action he suggested unwise, but in one respect he and his advisers, Spanish theologians and Italian men of affairs, were agreed—heresy in Germany must be suppressed by strong measures, and at once. The plea of Erasmus for unselfish reform and abstinence from repression was disregarded.

In Germany the dread of the Turks and the religious ferment were the leading features projected upon a background of political anarchy. The Emperor had returned (1521) to Spain, leaving behind him a Council of Regency, in which his brother Ferdinand and Frederick of Saxony were the leading figures. For some years a very open state of things existed. Plans for appropriating the annates to the Turkish War and heavily taxing the monasteries were proposed. Luther's temporary captivity in the Wartburg—his "Patmos," in reality his refuge from all dangers—left Melanchthon, the gentle scholar, Reuchlin's nephew and the leader of thought at Wittenberg, and Carlstadt, the reckless and outspoken innovator, to be leaders of the ecclesiastical opposition. The Diet at Nürnberg (1522) listened to Adrian's sincere promises of reform, qualified by assertions of its difficulty, but refused to carry out the Decree of Worms. To many Germans the suppression of Luther appeared to mean the sanction of felt abuses. Let the Pope call a free Council in Germany to settle everything. Until that met the Gospel was to be preached "in the true Christian sense." The utmost Germany would promise was a vague regulation of preachers and a censorship of the Press. But the execution of these

measures depended upon the local Princes, and was therefore ineffective. Meanwhile the Lutherans had declared monastic vows mistaken. Everywhere, especially among the Augustinians, monks were leaving their monasteries. Some, like Luther himself a little later, were taking wives. Changes in the Mass were demanded and sometimes made, not only the restoration of the chalice to the laity, but more radical alterations. But these ecclesiastical questions were overshadowed by politics—internally the warfare between Franz von Sickingen helped by the knights and some princes; externally the rivalry of France and Spain, with England thrown in as a deciding weight. The Lutheran movement had passed into its third stage—that of politics; it was bound up with German politics. Adrian was no politician, in spite of his political experience. "Let a man be never so good, how much depends upon the times in which he is born," he said once, and his times and his responsibilities were hard indeed. He represented some of the freshest currents of religious thought and represented them at the centre of Christianity, but the theologian of simple life (he lived on a ducat a day) was not strong enough for his task. But these new currents of thought had not yet lifted the Papacy from its Medieval moorings. And it had as yet no great organisation for clerical reform (such as the Inquisition had been in Spain) ready to its hand. When the Papacy had been moved, and the organisation had been found, Adrian's reform and cleansing of the Church might be accomplished. Until then political complications and the German tragedy were rending the Church's life.

Adrian's pathetic Papacy closed in 1523 (September 14th). His successor was Cardinal Giulio de Medici (Clement VII.), a clever Italian diplomatist and politician, a thorough man of affairs, as popular in Rome as Adrian had been unpopular. Germany first of all called for his attention. A Diet was to meet at Nürnberg (January, 1524), and Cardinal Campeggio appeared as legate. His reception was bad, and the utmost he could gain was an assurance that the Edict of Worms should be carried out as far as possible. Once more a Council was demanded: until it met a national assembly for the consideration of grievances was suggested. Meanwhile the Word of God was to be preached according to the Doctors of the Church. The Emperor was as displeased as the Pope at the disregard of the Edict so peculiarly his work. A Council, however, he wished for, and urged upon the Pope: Trent was even suggested as its seat. Clement felt his difficulty and sought help from Henry VIII., Luther's royal antagonist. Pressure on German merchants, applied by Henry, might be transmitted to German princes, and at any rate a protest might be raised against Germany alone considering and settling doctrines for Western Christendom.

Hostile camps—even in the Council of Regency itself—were by this time clearly formed. Upon the Pope's instructions the legate himself at Regensburg organised the Catholic party (June, 1524). Ferdinand, the Emperor's brother, who held the Austrian lands, and Bavaria took the lead. In Bavaria the University of Ingolstadt, where the controversialist Eck was a teacher, had been reorganised

**Divisions
in**

Germany.

**Regensburg
League,
1524.**

in a Catholic sense, the Duke's Chancellor, Leonard von Eck, strongly supporting the work.

A commission, independent of the Bishops, whose zeal did not satisfy the Duke, was appointed to degrade unworthy clerks; in return for the support given to the Church the Duke was granted a fifth of the ecclesiastical incomes in his territory, a grant renewed from time to time. Bavaria, long hesitating in its policy, now definitely took its stand on the Catholic side, but the impulse to this step had come from the State, inspired by the active influence of Eck. The religious tone of Austria, where the ducal support was secured in a like way, was the same, and these two States formed the nucleus of a strong Catholic league. If North Germany was the home of the Protestant revolt, South Germany was thus the home of the reaction against it. Around Bavaria and Austria gathered a group of princes, mainly ecclesiastical: from Salzburg, Basel (where the Bishop Christopher von Uttenheim, a friend of Erasmus, had greatly raised the tone of life), Augsburg, Strassburg, Passau, Brixen, Freising, and Trent. Some of these, especially Basel and Augsburg, had already begun reform and revival. The Conference of Regensburg formed three commissions, for the quarrels of clergy and laity, reform and doctrine respectively. Preachers were to be licensed and ordered to abide by the old Doctors of the Church: excessive fees were to be reduced: the number of holidays to be lessened: preachers were to be more earnest and priests more holy: the too free and trivial use of excommunication and interdicts, the abuses of Indulgences, were forbidden: the clergy were to be more restrained in life and dress: a commission of competent theologians in every

**Catholic
Reaction.**

diocese were to enforce these decisions; at the same time all Lutherans were to be expelled. Even thus early it was found that where the chances of Catholic reform were strongest, tenderness towards the Lutherans and a wish for reconciliation were the weakest. Thus the hostile camps were formed; there was a party of ecclesiastical reformers in sharp doctrinal opposition to Luther, but their relations to the Papacy were affected by political considerations, and especially by the attitude of the Pope and Emperor to each other. For the present, however, this party had enough influence with Charles to bring to nothing the proposed National Council. At a much later date Charles was inclined to adopt this suggestion, fearing it was his only way of securing reform.

Inside the Lutheran movement varying tendencies were seen. While in the Wartburg Luther began his **And in the Lutheran Movement itself.** New Testament (1522), followed by the Old Testament (to be finished only in 1534). Apart from its inestimable value to the nation, its influence upon the language was comparable to that of the English Bible upon England, and it placed Luther even more in touch with the national feeling. Already his boldness and his loud cry for reforms long ago and repeatedly demanded by the nation had given him a national position: now he popularised the scriptural movement begun on a large scale first by Erasmus. But if in some ways typically German, Luther was also typically scholastic; he never departed from the standpoint of his master Staupitz, as did other leaders of the revolt—unlike the Calvinists, he kept the crucifix and the Catholic vestments: unlike the Zwinglians he never denied the real and

bodily presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist: the iconoclasm of men like Carlstadt met with no sympathy from him: his sacramental doctrine—Consubstantiation—was an illogical attempt to keep what he regarded as essential in the Catholic doctrine, and at the same time to deny the form—Transubstantiation—in which that doctrine was generally and often crudely explained. The one part of Church life for which he felt no concern was that of government; a fact which may be accounted for: Church polity had been weakened by the stress laid upon Papal power, lowering the historic importance of Episcopate and priesthood: the monastic system instead of supplementing too often weakened Church order: in Germany, owing to the inroads of the princely families upon the sees and chapters, the Episcopate was weaker than elsewhere. Luther lived under these conditions, and—even if he disregarded his vows—was a monk at heart, although technically a friar. This was his doctrinal position, but he had been led on, much as Wiclif had been before him, to repudiate the Papacy as anti-Christian. Looking too exclusively upon the prevalent corruptions, he was absolutely free from any scruples as to a breach of unity or from any regard for the Church polity that secured it. It was here even more than in doctrine that he differed from Erasmus, to whom unity of organisation was an essential, the framework of Christian charity and the bond that formed it. Luther was fitted by his strong personality and his national enthusiasm to lead a great movement: he was conservative in many respects, but his conservatism lacked a sense of proportion: hence any movement led by him was likely to

become even more revolutionary than he and his followers meant. Had the movement been treated otherwise than it was, had the sense of proportion been supplied from outside, Luther might have led a great revival inside the Church—an upheaval akin to that wrought by the old monastic orders or the friars—instead of a separation from it. The manner in which he was met, his own lack of regard for unity, and the political state of Germany, combined to make his movement a schism.

Luther's comrade, Melanchthon—more learned and more of a theologian—was doctrinally, although not personally, more likely to lead a schism.

Melanchthon.

His *Loci Communes*—first produced in 1521 and revised in later editions—has been rightly called the first Protestant system of theology. From this book—said by Luther to be worthy of a place in the Canon—was derived a school of Protestant scholastics—building upon the Bible alone, interpreting it through a doctrinal system purely personal and subjective; independent to begin with, this school became later on more traditional, more fettered by great names than Medieval scholasticism itself. Broadly speaking, this system disregarded the whole outward life of the Church, laid small stress upon the Sacraments, and developed all theology from the kernel of justification by faith. Too much stress is often laid upon this the leading positive doctrine of Luther, and it is forgotten that his negations were as important in their effect. On the positive side many in high office held views approaching his, but they did not share his negations—his disregard of the Episcopate and general Church order. This central doctrine led

to much controversy — of the most unprofitable because most subjective kind — among Protestants themselves; it was blamed as the cause of much religious anarchy and moral licence. It was very significant that Erasmus, when urged to write against Luther, chose as his ground of attack the Free Will of man (the point upon which the Leipzig Disputation began); through the stress laid upon original sin and the Divine grace man's responsibility and his dependence upon the means of grace were held too lightly: this Erasmus felt, and hence his choice of topic.

The extreme doctrines of some preachers, such as Carlstadt, and of others more fanatic and less educated, joined to the social pressure upon the lower classes, produced the Peasants' Revolt (1524-5) and the Anabaptist Rising; the latter an attempt to set up a kingdom of God with community of goods and licence of life. Both in Germany and Switzerland there grew up an extreme wing of Reformers, carrying some of the Lutheran and Zwinglian doctrines further than their authors did, and in some cases combining religious innovation with social discontent. Thomas Münzer, at Zwickau (1521), and others, had not only declaimed against the existing system, and advocated change; they went further, and claimed direct inspiration; a new society—based on this new life and new power—was to be constructed; personal consecration and illumination was demanded from its members, hence infants were excluded and infant baptism denied; it was one of the many attempts to form a holy and elect society; Taborite (Hussite) influence helped in the earlier stages; not all the leaders were extreme or dangerous men; some were peaceful.

**Extreme
Doctrines.**

if ignorant followers of the earlier mystics; Luther, and even still more Zwingli, had stood in close relations with them. At Zürich the Anabaptist leaders were among Zwingli's earliest disciples, and felt disappointed when he would not join their separatist conventicles; he, for his part, was hurt at the discredit they brought upon his principles and his movement, and hence his measures against them were as harsh as their speech against him. But they could fairly claim that his principles could be stretched to cover their acts. Something of this same connection existed between the earlier Anabaptist movement and the Reformation in other places. It would be unjust to put down to all the Anabaptists the views of the extreme men, but historically and politically the movement was led by these.

While Luther was in the Wartburg these teachers of spiritual exaltation, hostile to learning, partly broke up the University at Wittenberg; only **Their Practical Results.** Luther's sudden reappearance and exercise of strong personal influence and common-sense checked the movement there (March, 1522). Yet under Carlstadt and Münzer it broke out again at Mühlhausen, marked this time by fiercer iconoclasm and attacks upon the monasteries (1524). But the Peasants' Revolt soon swallowed up this other movement. Like the English Peasants' Revolt in 1381, this was a complicated movement; in some places, as at Waldshut, an Austrian town, north-west of Zürich, and at Gröningen (south of Zürich), social and religious causes worked together, in others the two were distinct; as the social movement grew, it emphasised the democratic spirit of the religious revolution, objecting

to tithes, and claiming the appointment of the parish priests. Early in 1525 the war broke out, and resulted in the suppression of the peasants by the Princes. Luther, dreading the anarchy that might result from the rising, and not much in sympathy with its social causes (here he differed from Zwingli), had exhorted the Princes to act with firmness and strength. This they did, and although the fanatic rising at Münster (1534) was a later form of the movement, an extreme attempt to realise a free kingdom on earth, Social Revolution and aggressive Anabaptism perished together. The result was that the Princes—already the foremost element of the nation—had increased their power. Luther had ceased to be popular among the democracy, and his movement was discredited in the eyes of many by its association with Anabaptism. Many who had worked for reform, and looked to Lutheranism as likely to hasten it, now drew away from any connection with it.

Before 1524 the Humanist current had split itself into many diverse streams. Renaissance, Reformation, Counter-Reformation were all parts of one great movement aiming at improvement; different elements were mingled in different proportions in them, but the general problem before the world was to reject the evil elements and preserve the good. To do this should have been the special object of the Church. The Papacy, except on the artistic side, had not so far shown itself alive to this great need; and had it not been for a few great scholars like Erasmus, the Revival of Learning would not have been utilised for the service of the Church. Humanism had on the whole sympathised rather with

**Humanism
and the
German
Reformers.**

Luther than with his opponents. But a few years made a great difference. Ulrich von Hutten, discredited by his alliance with von Sickingen in his private war, noted for the licence of his life and the power of his pen, represented one division of the Humanists; Melanchthon, with all a scholar's enthusiasm and much of a scholar's timidity, stood for another; Erasmus, through many years firm in his principles and continuous in his work when all around were changing, stood for another. And these took different sides in the religious struggle. But there were others—Johann Faber (Vicar-General of Constanx, an early friend of Zwingli's and after a visit to Rome in 1522 an opponent of his), Pirkheimer, of Nürnberg, Cochleüs, and other scholars besides, who now definitely took up their stand on the anti-Lutheran side. The gathering at Regensburg (June, 1524) had been an expression of the same tendency. The forces of defence were drawing closer together against the forces of attack. But from this time onward the main weight of the purely Humanist movement was thrown upon the Catholic side; reform itself—much as it was desired—seemed to many of less importance than unity and the maintenance of faith. The Anabaptist movement and the Peasants' War had helped to bring about this result. The death of Ulrich von Hutten (end of August, 1523), one of the more revolutionary Humanists, may be taken as the water-shed between the Renaissance and the Reformation. Refused—and with some reason—the friendship of Erasmus at Basel, he found a resting-place at Zürich, where Zwingli—himself the product of Humanism, and with little regard for authority and tradition—befriended him. From this time Zwingli stood apart, not

only from his former "master," Erasmus, but from his old friend Glareanus (Lörity), "the shadow of Erasmus," as he was called. In September, 1524, the treatise of Erasmus on Free-will marked his definite opposition to the new movement. Luther he had considered, so he said, a kind of necessary evil in the corrupt state of the Church. From such a violent remedy he had hoped for a return of health to the Christian body. But now a new, rude, and intractable generation was growing up; the ranters who had arisen would ruin both the Gospel and good letters. If he must be a slave, he had rather be a slave to Pope and Bishops than to these newly risen tyrants. It was for the sake of good letters in the sacred sense understood by him that Erasmus—much as he hated gladiatorial contests—stepped into the hated arena.

In 1526 a Diet was to meet at Speier, but much had happened before it met. The victory of Pavia (February 25, 1525) had made Francis I. of France a captive to Charles, and had thus given the Papacy reason to dread the Emperor: the possessor of Naples could not be allowed to grow too powerful in Italy. At the very time the Diet met the Papal troops and those of France and Milan, with England as a cool ally, were fighting against the Emperor. Francis had been set free by a treaty (January 14th, 1526), in which, among other things, he promised help against heresy. But Clement, for political reasons, released Francis from the obligation of his oath, which, indeed, sat only too lightly upon him, and the anti-Spanish League of Cognac followed (May 22nd, 1526). The Allies, however, met with small success. In Germany too the Princes were

considering alliances; in July, 1525, Duke George of Saxony, the Elector of Brandenburg, the Archbishop of Mainz, and others met at Dessau to discuss a Catholic league; in October the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse—the ablest and least conventional of the Protestant leaders—tried to form a Protestant alliance to hinder the proposed enforcement of the Edict of Worms and arrest the persecution already begun of Protestant preachers. At Gotha (February, 1526) Hesse and Saxony (where the Elector Frederick had been succeeded by his brother John, May, 1525) formed such a league, enlarged (June, 1526) by the adhesion of three Brunswick Princes, Anhalt, and the city of Magdeburg. It was not likely, therefore, that the ecclesiastical unity of Germany could be maintained. The Emperor, keenly alive to the danger of heresy and specially anxious to carry out his own Edict of Worms, was not likely to concede too much to the Pope. The old complaints against the Curia and the Church were renewed when the Diet met at Speier (June 25th, 1526); a majority of the Princes decided in favour of the marriage of priests, communion in both kinds, the reduction of holidays, the abolition of private Masses, and a restricted use of German in the Mass and Holy Baptism; the appointment of Bishops—practically in the hands of the Pope, Emperor, or Princes—was freely criticised. But Ferdinand, who in the Emperor's absence took his place, forbade in his name all innovations, and pending a General Council (the national German Assembly Charles would not at present hear of), urged the execution of the Edict of Worms. But the Princes, knowing that Charles's relations with the Pope were now altered, deemed him unlikely to press an Edict which

the cities held impracticable. It was resolved to consult the Emperor, now in Spain, upon the point, and until his opinion was received, a provisional arrangement was made: "Every State should so behave, rule, and believe as it should hope and trust to answer before God, the Emperor, and the Empire."

This celebrated decision has often been described as the basis of territorial religion in Germany—of the principle, "*Cujus regio, ejus religio*." It was impossible to get concerted action between an Emperor with other realms to think of and funds too small for his needs, a Pope led by political considerations, and Princes bent, if orthodox, upon secularising bishoprics, if Lutheran, upon the organisation of separatist bodies, and so this temporary arrangement did become a permanent basis. But it became so purely because of later facts and not because it was meant to legalise the ecclesiastical change that was widely carried out. It gave no legal footing to Protestantism within the Empire, but no legal sanction was needed in an anarchical realm for anything with vitality enough to exist. The Emperor could hardly approve the decision, but he acquiesced in its results. Some of his advisers recommended the abolition of penalties for heresy and the summoning of a Council to restore ecclesiastical unity. But politics and unity went badly together. In **Sack of Rome, May, 1527.** May, 1527, an Imperial army sacked Rome itself, and the Pope was, in fact, a prisoner of the Emperor's. These strained relations—only partly ended by the Pope gaining his freedom in November, 1527, and fully ended in June, 1529, by the Treaty of Barcelona—allowed religious matters in Germany to settle themselves.

Ferdinand had been at first strongly anti-Lutheran; he gained greatly in income from the Church in his duchies; he had suffered much from the Peasants' Revolt, but events withdrew him from too active interference in Germany and gave him other interests. The Emperor Maximilian, following old dynastic aims and fortunate in their attainment, had married his grandson Ferdinand to Anna, sister of Lewis II., King of Hungary and Bohemia, while Lewis himself was married to Ferdinand's sister Mary. In battle against the Turks—the plague of Eastern Europe—Lewis fell at Mohacs (August 30th, 1526). Bohemia elected Ferdinand as King (October, 1526); he had to conform to the compact of Basel and promise if possible to secure an archbishop for the Utraquists, and hence at the Council of Trent he was found urging the permission of communion in both kinds. In Hungary, where Zapolya was a dangerous rival, Ferdinand's sister Mary secured her brother the throne, and in 1527 he was acknowledged as king there also. Thus the composite Habsburg territories gained a large addition, and Ferdinand gained interests not purely German; above all, his new kingdom bound him to oppose the Turks with all his strength.

In Germany the organisation of the new religious bodies was now carried out in Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Ansbach, Anhalt (Köthen), Brunswick-Lüneburg, East Friesland, Silesia, Schleswig-Holstein, and East Prussia. The last state **The Reformed Body in Germany.** Albert of Brandenburg, Grandmaster of the Teutonic Knights, secularised (1525) into a hereditary duchy. The great cities of North Germany were also by this time mainly Lutheran. The new ecclesiastical

organisation was in all cases made under the direction of the civil ruler and by his authority. The principle "*Cujus regio, ejus religio*" was so far accepted as to give large powers to the Prince, both in forming the religion of his state and settling its details. Every prince, said the Strassburg preacher Capito later, was head of the Church in his territory, appointed as such by Christ in his own place. The organisation of Saxony may be taken as a type: Four commissions of laymen and clergy visited four divisions of the Electorate; stress was laid upon teaching, provided for by catechisms modelled upon earlier works, and upon preaching; superintendents of the clergy were appointed by the Elector, and these took the place of bishops. German was used, of course, in the services, and Luther's hymns added a further national element; the old portions of Scripture selected for epistles and gospels were kept; the continued use of the vestments (although forbidden in Prussia), the crucifix and candles upon the altars, made the breach of continuity less noticeable.

The Zwinglian model (yet to be spoken of), which was to creep northwards in later years, made its entire breach with the past more apparent; the vestments and altar ornaments were removed; the polity set up was congregational and democratic; everything was cut down to the barest. But the rise of this separate movement and its historical importance have yet to be noticed.

After the Conference at Regensburg (1524) the suppression of heretical opinions had become *its* much stricter in the lands of the Princes **Opponents**. present there; nowhere, however, was it stricter than

in the Netherlands, Charles's own dominions. His dislike of Lutheranism grew; he and the Pope felt greater need of each other's help, and at length (1527) Clement promised a Council. The year 1529 marked the height of Charles's power: the Treaty of Barcelona (June, 1529), signed by him and the Pope, recognised him as Emperor, while Florence was gained for the Medici and the Papal States secured. The Treaty of Cambrai which followed gave up the French claims in Italy; all parties to these treaties bound themselves to extirpate heresy. The same year Charles was crowned, but at Bologna not at Rome (February 24th, 1529)—the last Emperor crowned in Italy. The German Diets had of late years been either put off or been too poorly attended to do much business. Now, with the Pope and Emperor in league with him, and the ecclesiastical Princes upon his side, Charles resolved to attempt a settlement of the religious difficulties. The Lutherans, on the other hand, were not only alarmed at the turn of politics, but disturbed by rumours of plots against them. Otto von Pack, formerly a minister of Duke George of Saxony, showed the Landgrave of Hesse a forged document indicating such a plot, and the Elector prepared for war. The discovery of the falsity of his information embittered both him and his opponents, so that the Diet of Speier (February 21st, 1529) found parties even more at discord than before. The Emperor was determined that the Decree of 1526 must be amended. Ferdinand was anxious to suppress all heresy. Inside the reformed camp a division, not merely one of the many shades of differences that later on led to diversity, but a real and fundamental division had arisen.

The divergence of Zwinglian from Lutheran, and their hatred of each other, gave the Catholic party in the Diet a great advantage. Zwinglianism, moreover, struck at Habsburg power where it had old claims, not urged of late, but never given up in theory. Switzerland was a link between the Netherlands and Italy, and Milan could not well be held without control of Switzerland. Zürich, moreover, the seat of Zwingli's movement, was akin to the cities of Southern Germany; once an Imperial City like them, it had many ties of interest and relation with them; it now gave signs of extending its power northwards, and so politically was a special danger to the Empire. Thus the very division that weakened the Protestants (to anticipate the name they gained at this Diet) made Charles more desirous to suppress them.

At Speier the consent of the Pope to a new Council was declared, and it was proposed by the Emperor's representatives to revoke the Decree of 1526, replacing it by a declaration against any innovation. This change of policy was favoured by the majority of the Princes, who also wished to forbid any toleration of sects denying the Sacrament of the Altar. But the Landgrave of Hesse and some Imperial cities wished to leave things as they were—the liberty practically gained in 1526 had sent them much further on the paths of change. Attempts at mediation, in which one side was ready to sacrifice something—the territorial power of the Bishops, and the other side to throw over what they termed the "godless" followers of Zwingli, led to no result.

From their formal protest against the final decision, embodying an appeal to a free Council or a really

national assembly, the party of change gained the name of Protestant. The protestors were the Elector John of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, two of the Dukes of Lüneburg, Wolfgang of Anhalt-Köthen, and the cities of Strassburg, Ulm, Nürnberg, Weissenberg, St. Gallen, Constanz, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nordlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, and Windsheim. Their refusal to abide by the decision of the majority emphasised (although it did not begin) the break-up of the Empire: their declared intention to stand by the Decree of 1526 put an interpretation upon that which it had not been intended to bear. Their real appeal was to revolution, and to the individual's right to choose his religion for himself; this principle was not however extended, to begin with, below princes and cities that were almost republics. But it was in essence a repudiation of authority, and a declaration of freedom, such as Luther had made for himself at Worms. It involved first and foremost a repudiation of the Papacy and Papal power in any shape. Historically such a repudiation is the meaning of Protestant, although of late years the fashion has been to apply the word more loosely to bodies arising from the Reformation and in sympathy with its aims. In either case it asserts the freedom of the individual, and it has led to repeated divisions. The historic Church might claim one sanction of Divine authority: the individual conscience another like sanction. It was an evil thing that a difference between the two sanctions should be widely felt, and it was so far as this difference arose from unreformed abuses a reproach to the Church. But if the latter sanction, un-

checked by the former, were to be the guiding element in religion divisions were bound to be multiplied. No appeals to the force of great leaders—such as Luther had now become—could well gloss over the dissension that arose from appeals made solely to the varying conscience of the individual. This was to be felt in later years.

The decision of this Diet of Speier, against which the protest was made, stood as follows: The Edict of Worms should be enforced in the Catholic territories as before: in the territories which had become Lutheran no fresh innovations were to be brought in, and the Mass was not to be prohibited. No ecclesiastical body should be deprived of authority, property, or income. The sects which denied the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ were to receive no toleration any more than the Anabaptists. The agreement of Emperor and Pope, the consolidation of the Catholic Princes, their dread of the growing movement, and, lastly, differences which had arisen in the movement itself, had brought about this result. It was a decided check to the Lutherans, for it set up again the jurisdiction of the Bishops, never legally abolished so far as the Empire was concerned. It is easy to point out the narrow limits of toleration set up, the recognition of religious differences, which it was yet wished to prevent from growing. But the problem was a new one: the existence of religious bodies outside the Church; and in marked opposition to it. No State had hitherto been called upon to deal with so momentous a question: the Church, its limits and authority, had always been accepted as part of the normal conditions of civil life.

**Results of
the Diet of
Speier.**

It was a hard problem for any State to solve, especially when it received no help from the Church beyond a verbal condemnation of the novelty. It was a specially hard problem for the Empire, with its many local differences and its lack of central power. Political conditions had intensified the crisis; they seemed likely to make it permanent, for the Reformation emphasised the special weaknesses of German life. Because of the shape into which these political conditions had forced the movement, and because of the personality of Luther, the Reformation, so far as it gave rise to separations from the Church, will always seem to many purely German in its origin and growth.

CHAPTER IV

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND AND ITS CONNECTION WITH GERMANY

THE cantons of Switzerland had gained their freedom after a long struggle with the house of Habsburg: the cities Luzern, Bern, and Zürich had histories like that of the Imperial cities of the Empire, and indeed the last was itself an old Imperial town. Inside the Confederation there were rivalries between the city and country cantons, while the Federal tie was of the very loosest, lying in the Diets to which the cantons sent ambassadors with no powers for settlement except after reference to their cantons. The conquests of the Confederates, the Free Bailiwicks, and the Thurgau, were governed by the cantons in rotation, and this system was a later cause of religious strife. The peculiarity of the causes tending to freedom in the case of Switzerland has often been exaggerated: the facts that the overlords of much of it were the Habsburgs absorbed as they were in Imperial politics, and that the land was well fitted for defence, gave the Swiss leagues a permanence not shared by the similar German leagues. This almost accidental growth of Switzerland led to its ecclesiastical unity being

Swiss
History.

weak : of the dioceses Constanx and Chur were under Mainz ; Basel and Lausanne under Besançon ; Sitten (Sion), until exempted by Leo X., under Tarantaise. The moral state of the clergy was low by comparison with other lands ; both they and the monastic orders were less free from State control than was the case elsewhere : the "Parson's Charter" (1370) had subjected them to civil jurisdiction as well as taxation. Towards the close of the Middle Ages successes against Burgundy and in Italy gave the Swiss a great reputation, so that they were eagerly sought as mercenaries. Hence there resulted entanglements in outside politics, and a corruption of the old simple and mainly agricultural life of old. These complications, added to the division between Romance or French Switzerland and Teutonic or German Switzerland, gave the country a peculiar importance. For the Teutonic part looked towards Southern Germany with its Imperial cities, while the Romance part was entangled with France and Savoy. This twofold connection gave the Reformation in Switzerland a curious character : international in external relations, dividing Germany by the severance between Zwinglians and Lutherans, affecting French thought through Calvin, it was yet on its internal side involved in the Federal history. The career of Zwingli, however, not only checked the needed development of the Federal constitution, but divided the nation into hostile camps ; the rivalry between Luther and Zwingli, growing into the fatal division of Lutheran and Reformed, added to the disunion of Germany and altered the currents of theological thought.

Huldreich Zwingli, brought up under Humanist

influence (especially at Basel), had passed some years as a parish priest at Glarus and Einsiedeln before being called (1518) to Zürich. He had Zwingli,
1484-1531. the national character — sturdy, common-sense, and proud of freedom. Twice he visited Italy as chaplain to the army in the field, and formed a strong opinion against mercenary warfare; but his private life at first reached no high standard. He had by a different road and from another starting-point reached a doctrinal position like Luther's, but his career was only possible in a city commonwealth. Zürich was his field of work, and here, working on the basis of civic politics, he won over the Chapter and the citizens to begin with, and then developed his ecclesiastical system. It took its shape from the mould that contained it: the two Councils—the Small or Senate and the Great Council of two hundred—were the chief authorities in Church as in State; it was they who regulated worship, reformed or remodelled the great Chapter, and abolished the monasteries, gave the revenues so gained to a theological College and a School, called the Public Disputations which marked each stage of the Reformation at Zürich, and although mainly led by Zwingli, also conducted the religious policy of the city. Zürich was in the diocese of Constanx, and the Reformation here took therefore the form of a city's revolt against outside episcopal control, and a seizure for itself of the direction of religious life.

Zwingli, in later years, claimed to have been quite independent of Luther in the growth of his ideas. In this claim he was probably justified, although Luther's conclusions and his personal courage had gained

Zwingli's admiration. In his broad conclusions he did not at first differ from Luther, but he started
Zwingli's not at first differ from Luther, but he started
Opinions. from the basis of a free and intellectual study of the Scriptures interpreted by the individual powers and for the individual needs. This was Humanism pure and simple, unfettered or unchecked, as with Erasmus, by regard for religious authority and the unity of the Church. In spite of his earlier unchaste life Zwingli, even at Glarus, had a sincerely religious spirit, which he kept, but his humanism and his firm belief in unchecked individualism, the inspiration of the individual by the Spirit of God, made him the revolutionary theologian of the Reformation. It was not accident that he, unlike Erasmus, was prepared to befriend the revolutionary and scandal-causing Hutten: it was not accident that the movement at Zürich had closer affinities with Anabaptism and with Socinianism than were possible for Lutheranism. The Church was to Zwingli simply an aggregate of individuals, a local society based on a voluntary and reasonable agreement, moulded and coloured by the political condition under which it existed. Sacraments were merely signs, the efficacy of which depended solely upon the individual power of perception; all external aids to religion — images, pictures, pilgrimages, festivals, organs, things upon which the simpler Christian had leaned — were hindrances to the individual life, the true support of which was to be found only in an enlightened study of the Scriptures and a faithful attendance at Sermons. The intellect thus played a part in his system far beyond that played by the emotions; the pulpit took the place of the altar. But

given this basis of doctrine, and this view of religion, an association of Christian men, borrowing less from the ancient Church than did the Lutheran bodies of Germany, was, although of secondary importance, helpful for purposes of study, prayer, and exposition. Thus the congregation found a place, and Humanism with its intellectual vigour and its independent criticism was joined to a congregational system developed in a city state. By the end of 1524 the religious changes at Zürich were completed; images were removed from the churches; pictures covered or washed over; the use of lights, bells, and organs was put an end to; the Baptismal service was simplified to bareness, while a congregational Communion in wooden cups and trenchers and around tables replaced the stately Mass.

**The
System
Complete,
1524.**

Apart from its religious importance, the career of Zwingli had a political side; he had a high conception of the pastor's office. In a democratic country, and even more in a city common-wealth, every citizen had his part in politics, and every minister—as a prophet to inspire and exhort, to sow ideas, and rouse men to act—had his leading part to fulfil: the sermons preached, not only to the citizens, but to the country people who flocked into the city on market days; the printed manifestoes that were circulated in their thousands, for Zwingli was a political pamphleteer of skill, and the booksellers gave him a ready organisation to hand; the Public Disputations of January and October, 1523, to which representatives from other Swiss towns were invited—all these, although not peculiar to Zürich, gave Zwingli a useful machinery for forming and organising opinion.

**Zwingli's
Political
Ideas.**

But the political circumstances of Zürich, a city which had aspired to be the leading state of Eastern Switzerland and followed an independent policy of its own, made these features of Zwingli's movement more significant. The Emperor and the French, and now the Pope through his recruiting agent, Cardinal Schinner, Bishop of Sion (Sitten), were competing for the support of Swiss mercenaries. Zwingli's Italian experience had made him dislike foreign service, with its easily earned wealth and corrupting influence; even at Glarus he had opposed the French faction, and this, joined to his renown as a preacher, had made the anti-French party at Zürich eager to secure him. The Pope had, as it seemed to Zwingli, who was appointed (1518) a Papal chaplain and offered further promotion and rewards, peculiar claims upon the help of Zürich. It was only (1519) when he differed from the Papal politics in the election of Emperor that he first became definitely anti-Papal, and doctrine had very little to do with this change. It is true that Zwingli, somewhat as Luther with Tetzl, had opposed Samson, a preacher of Indulgences, who came to Zürich in 1519; but the ecclesiastical authorities supported Zwingli and Zürich in the matter, and he was subsequently offered promotion at Rome. As regarded ecclesiastical organisation the Zürich movement was satisfied by the rejection of episcopal control; the Papal power presented itself more as a question of politics than of control or government, and it was as such that Zwingli, and Zürich with him, finally rejected it. But the Papacy, owing to its old relations with Zürich, and its desire to keep the city as an ally, now treated Zwingli very differently from Luther.

Zürich had pretensions to the leadership of Switzerland in the East, and it had also close relations with the South German cities bound to it by commerce and democratic sympathies. Before long (1524) the religious ideal of Zwingli became bound up with politics; if his city gained greater power in the Confederation it could extend the Reformation; equally the Reformation gave it a chance of increasing its power. In trying to urge Protestantism upon the subject lands it touched the Confederation where its system was weakest—in the government of these dependencies by the cantons in turn, each with a distinct religious policy of its own. Its championship of the Reformation against the Forest Cantons (Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden), along with Zug, really broke up the Confederation into hostile camps. The problem of religious differences in a Federal State should have been less difficult to solve than in an Empire or Kingdom, but Zwingli presented it so as to bring Zürich forward. It was doubtful whether religion was a matter of Federal or Cantonal authority; it should have been possible to reach a solution which kept both Federal unity and local freedom, but Zwingli was too violent in his demands for religious supremacy. A further complication came in when Zürich pushed or protected the Reformation in the subject lands. This put a strain upon the Federal constitution which it was not equal to bear, and (1529) war broke out. Bern, where a reformation roughly similar to that of Zürich had been carried out (1528), was on the side of Zürich for defence if not for attack. The First Peace of Kappel (June 24th, 1529) only put off the struggle. Religious

offenders in the subject lands were not to be punished (as the Catholic Cantons had desired); the majority in each community were to decide for the Catholic Mass or the Zwinglian substitute, as they preferred. Other causes of complaint, arising from previous violence on each side, were settled favourably for Zürich. It should be noted that in Switzerland, as elsewhere, the secularisation of the monasteries had been a leading object: at Zürich the funds so gained had been put to educational uses; at Bern to political; the popular desire for a share in the results had in some places led to riots and been a link between the Reformation and the Peasants' Revolt.

By this Peace of 1529 the Catholic Cantons were forced to give up their alliance with Austria, which had indeed not led to the results expected. But the question of external alliances had been one which, apart from religion, went near to wrecking the Confederation. Zwingli had, even in 1524, looked to foreign alliances, notably to France and Savoy, as means for strengthening Zürich in the Confederation; when he came into touch with Philip of Hesse his political activity was quickened. The Christian Civic League (*das Christliche Bürgerrecht*)—a league of cities united for defence and war upon the basis of religious unity, begun (Christmas, 1527) by Zürich and Constanzt, joined afterwards by S. Gallen, Biel, Mühlhausen, Basel, Schaffhausen, and, lastly, Strassburg (1530)—partly realised the aims of Zwingli. But Hesse, in spite of Zwingli's endeavour, was not included; nor was the cause of Ulrich of Württemberg taken up. The Christian Union—a league of the Catholic Cantons under Austrian protection, meant

to extend still further—was a reply to this earlier league. In Switzerland, as in Germany, the Reformation had thus divided the nation into two distinct camps. The Peace of Kappel recognised this division, and the clauses by which toleration was to obtain between the cantons led to disagreement. The Zwinglians thought that they might in future preach freely, not only in the subject lands, but in the Catholic Cantons as well; these latter thought they were left perfectly free to guide their own religious policy. Of such disagreements the Second War of Kappel (1531) was the inevitable result. Dread of the Emperor and a little war on the Italian border hastened the end, but the demand of Zürich that preaching should be freely allowed everywhere showed the real aims of Zwingli. Bern, although tardily and with half its heart, was now on his side, but at Zürich itself lack of unity and spirit made itself felt. The battle (October 11th, 1531) left Zwingli among the slain with many of his keenest supporters.

Through the mediation of France and the cantons not actually at war, peace was made (November 23rd). The victors did not press their advantage, but the Christian Civic League was put an end to: the Reformed communities in the subject lands were left alone, and everywhere Catholic minorities were protected. But the failure of Zwingli's scheme to force Protestantism upon the other cantons was significant: in Glarus, Solothurn, and the Aargau Catholicism gained the upper hand. Bern, influenced by Strassburg—from its position and inclination a mediator between Switzerland and Germany—became more Lutheran. The danger from

**Second
Peace of
Kappel,
1531.**

Zwinglianism which had led the Imperialist advisers to consider Zürich (1531) "the head of Lutheranism" was over. The city was still a refuge for Protestant theologians from Germany or England: the reputation of Zwingli made it almost a place of pilgrimage, and the diplomatic intercourse begun by him still continued, but its importance was immensely lower: Bern, and shortly Geneva, under the dominating spirit of Calvin, outstripped it. The division of the Confederation was intensified by the progress of the Catholic reaction. Hugo von Landenberg, Bishop of Constanz, and Christopher von Uttenheim, Bishop of Basel, had both been well abreast of the movement for better discipline, and Luzern shared their impulses. Faber, Vicar-General of Constanz, and the chief opponent of Zwingli in the Public Disputations, afterwards Cardinal and Bishop of Vienna, led the reaction with skill for some years. Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, drew closer an older link with Switzerland: his Swiss college at Milan, his introduction into the country of the Jesuits (1574-81), of the Capuchins (1581-8), and his establishment of a permanent nunciature at Luzern, supplied the lack of organisation from which the country had suffered. The Luzern statesman, Ludwig Pfyffer (1586), formed the Borromean League, a revival as it were of the Christian Union, including the Forest Cantons, with Zug, Solothurn, and Freiburg. We are apt to be severe in judging the anomalous contrivances, "Interims," and Religious Peaces by which Germany patched up religious strife, but Switzerland did not even attain to them: religious divisions, unsoftened by such expedients, even when working on a less favour-

able field than incoherent Germany, had their own disastrous result.

The Anabaptist movement appeared in Switzerland also, and was there even more closely connected with the Reformation than elsewhere. Andreas The Carlstadt sought a new field of work when Anabaptists Luther returned to Wittenberg from the at Zürich. Wartburg (March, 1522): first at Orlamünde, near Wittenberg, and then in South Germany. Before leaving Wittenberg he had joined hands with Thomas Münzer, who had preached a socialistic iconoclastic religion at Zwickau, in Thuringia, and on being driven thence had gone to Wittenberg. These two men gathered around them the doctrinally and socially discontented. Bohemian influence gave the movement a strong anti-ecclesiastical direction: the hierarchy and Church orders were condemned, the impulses of the individual exalted to a revelation, and the mystical or fanatical theories which had flourished in the Middle Ages gained new force when inspired by restless discontent and confronted by abuses often firmly fixed. This general movement, springing up in many centres where local causes made its growth easier and grouping itself mainly around a few special leaders, is broadly named Anabaptist. But although the varied elements combined or grew together they had no common origin; on a lower, less educated, and more fanatic plane, it is analogous in origin and history to the Reformation movement which grouped itself around Luther. A short account of Anabaptism at Zürich brings out the main points in its history there and elsewhere.

Among those of Zwingli's followers who, by eating

meat in Lent began the revolt against authority **Anabaptism.** (1522), were the future leaders of local Anabaptism; a little later (1523) they outran the magistrates' action in the destruction of crucifixes and images. They soon appear as a distinct party, radical in their views but not bound together by any express doctrinal belief; their repudiation of infant baptism sprang rather from dislike to the methods of Christian organisation than any doctrinal tenets. An agitation against the payment of tithes—a point on which the Peasants' Revolt was in sympathy with them—arose in many local centres near Zürich. Zwingli himself was embarrassed by the movement; its leaders had been among his earlier and most enthusiastic followers; in their denial of the efficacy of baptism, in their dislike to tithes, they would quote his teaching in their favour although he did not reach their practical conclusions. When they began to found a distinct society, consisting solely of "converted" adults, he urged them not to weaken his hands; they, on the other hand, regarded him as "a lost leader": while they were bitter in their language he had the magistracy on his side, and was thus enabled to be severe in his measures of repression. But the presence of Münster at Waldshut (an Austrian town N.W. of Zürich where religious cabals were of importance in the relations of Habsburgs and Zürich), and of Carlstadt at Zürich, strengthened the Swiss Anabaptists locally and merged them in the wider movement. The well-deserved catastrophe of that movement at Münster (1533) discredited, and, on the whole, suppressed it, but here and there isolated strains of Anabaptist views survived and at times appeared on the surface.

The relations of Zwingli to Luther, and of their respective followers to each other, were significant in the history of thought, and became of great importance to Germany. Zwingli regarded no authority, and was bound by no traditions in his exegesis of Scripture: hence his anger against those who, as the Anabaptists, took an individual view other than his own. From the sacramental teaching of the Church there could be deduced the necessity of Holy Orders: the Sacraments and the Ministry were bound together. The necessity for the latter fitted in badly with Zwingli's view of organisation: the stress he laid upon the educated intellect made him averse from any ideas of grace conveyed otherwise than by spiritual or mental inspiration. But the exegesis by which the "is" in "This is my body" was explained as "signifies" was put before him by a Dutch theologian, Cornelius van Hoen, who considered its novelty made the suggestion worthy of being brought before theologians by a special messenger. Zwingli, who had not dealt with the doctrine of the Presence in his writings before 1522, adopted this exegesis, and made it peculiarly his own. But he felt it was needful his views should be put forward, since Carlstadt, who, in some respects, shared them, was being taken as their chief exponent. For Zwingli, unlike Carlstadt, laid great stress upon the Church as a society (although of purely civic and natural growth), and hence regarded the Communion as a corporate act: at one with Carlstadt in his denial of a supernatural presence, akin to him in the rites and form of administration he preferred, he differed widely from him in the stress laid upon the corporate nature of the Feast.

It was, indeed, Zwingli's regard for the corporate life that made him, in opposition to the Anabaptists, lay stress upon the rightfulness of infant baptism. From the year 1524 Zwingli's view of the Eucharist, and especially his negative teaching, was vigorously put forth. Fitting in so well as it did with his theory of organisation and his general system, it found a ready hearing. For it was both revolutionary and logical: it was easy to understand, and it gave a firm resting-place to those who approached the subject in a spirit of hostility to what the Church had taught. Even its very novelty—for the denial of any peculiar Presence in the Communion was novel—recommended it to many. Because he was the first great teacher who took this revolutionary view, and the one who taught it most effectively, the purely rational and symbolic view of the Sacrament of the Altar is always known as Zwinglianism.

Zwingli's doctrinal position was thus very different from that of Luther; he and his followers were both more thorough and more open to suspicion; while the Lutherans always claimed to hold the Catholic faith, and were sensitive to the charge that they did not, the Zwinglians held such a charge a trifle: ordination of ministers, Church organisation and doctrine, were all powerless before the individual's enlightened conclusions and the decision of the civic magistracy. Thus, in the second Peace of Kappel, the Zwinglians consented to give the Catholic Cantons the title of adherents of "the Christian religion"; thus, too, Melancthon and other theologians suspected Zwingli and his followers of Unitarianism. But sympathy with the Swiss and

dislike of the German princes led the South German allies to adopt Zwingli's views: Ulm, Mainz, Strassburg, among cities; Württemberg, Hesse, and Friesland among territories were all Zwinglian.

The Lutheran Princes had not yet given up all thought of a Reformed Papal Church with which they might be in accord. The suspicions brought upon Protestantism by the Zwinglians **Attempts at reconciliation** came as an obstacle to such a result. Hence

the Landgrave Philip, with whom it was a great object to form a strong Protestant League, urged union, and a preparatory discussion to prepare for it. At Michaelmas (1529) both Lutherans and Zwinglians met at Marburg, where the central point of discussion was the method of the Presence. Zwingli, while firm in his own views, was ready to make a league which would leave room for difference. Luther stood equally firm in his literal interpretation of the words of institution. It seemed as if the vital point lay here, but the real difference lay deeper; Luther was more ready to admit the supernatural than was Zwingli, who was a rationalist in his conceptions. They left the Conference with the doctrinal split more clearly realised than ever, and with the political split, imposed upon it, almost as clearly realised. This division was henceforth a leading feature in German life; the theological bitterness caused by it reacted on theology generally, and the many attempts at reunion, in which Bucer was largely concerned (from the Wittenberg Concord, May, 1536, onwards), encouraged a loose use of language to conceal differences of view. But the importance which the Catholic Church attached to tradition and authority was given outside of it to

names of great leaders. These leaders really differed essentially; the demand for their agreement was due to political needs although they might indeed have agreed in negations of Catholic doctrines. But such agreement was no real basis for a living and growing body. This was soon found out, and after the death of Luther (1546) Melanchthon was accused of whittling down his doctrine and tending towards reunion with Rome. The divisions that multiplied themselves made a full reunion of parties impossible, and wrought endless harm everywhere, but most of all in Germany.

As the Emperor's power grew divisions in Germany were becoming more marked; to the Catholic League **Church** formed at Regensburg corresponded the Pro-
Politics testant League of Torgau. The Emperor,
in Germany. now at peace with France and the Papacy, was bound along with them to suppress heresy, which, as a matter of faith and apart from political considerations, he loathed. There was now a further cause of fear, lest through the influence of Zwingli the cities of the Oberland, joining with the Swiss Reformed Cantons, should together throw off the supremacy of the Empire. This was the state of affairs when, in February, 1529, the Diet (see p. 58) met at Speier. Here the consent of the Pope to a Council was declared, and it was proposed by the Emperor's representatives to revoke the decree of 1526, substituting for it a declaration against any innovation. The majority of the princes were in favour of this, and wished to forbid any toleration to sects who denied the Sacrament of the Altar. On the other hand, the Landgrave of Hesse and some of the Imperial cities wished to

leave things as they were; they protested against having to surrender the liberty gained in 1526.

In June, 1530, at Augsburg, the Emperor in person opened the Diet from which so much was expected; he was anxious, he told them, to end the religious dissensions, if possible, without force; but irritation that had arisen through the Evangelical court preachers exercising their vocation in the city promised badly for peace. And the issue corresponded to the omen. The Lutheran theologians had drawn up a Confession of their Faith on the basis of the seventeen articles agreed upon previously at Schwabach; the document, which contained twenty-one articles upon doctrine and seven upon abuses to be reformed, had been formulated by Melancthon, and was read before the Diet. As an Apology (its original title) it had a peculiar character; it was intended to conciliate the Catholics, and it tried, therefore, to defend the doctrines expressed from possible charges—those on the Eucharist from the charge of the Zwinglian conceptions, and others from the charge of Anabaptist tendencies—hence, as an expression of so-called reforming tendencies it was too cautious to be complete. Among the most important articles were—the sixth, which asserted that true faith had good works as a fruit, and that every man was bound to perform them, but could not depend upon them for salvation; the seventh, which asserted the existence of a holy Catholic Church, made up of all the faithful, and marked, not by a uniformity in ritual or rules, but by the effective preaching of the Word and pure administration of the Sacraments. By other articles the Real Presence was asserted, auricular

**Diet and
Confession
of Augs-
burg, 1530.**

confession retained along with absolution, but the need of a particular enumeration of sins was denied. The abuses noted were: the denial of the cup, clerical celibacy, the Mass as an offering for quick or dead, the conception of Confession and Absolution as a sacrament, the excessive number of ceremonies, the institution of monastic vows, abuses of ecclesiastical, especially of episcopal, power, which ought to be distinguished from the civil power it so often encroached upon.

The four Imperial cities of Strassburg, Constanz, Lindau, and Memmingen presented a separate **Confessio Tetra-** fession (Confessio Tetrapolitana), drawn up by Bucer and Capito, which differed from **politana.** the former mainly upon the Eucharist, in denying, although guardedly, anything of a bodily Presence or bodily manducation. A Confutation of the Confession prepared by Eck, Wimpina, Faber, and others was read and circulated; it was remarkable as showing signs of agreement with it upon the doctrine of justification by faith. Compromise upon this point was, in truth, less difficult than is often thought. Unless faith was taken to be the all in all, apart from means of grace or works, it was not difficult to reconcile justification by faith with the Catholic doctrine (often obscured by its advocates), according to which faith is a divinely implanted germ and leads to a righteous life exhibited as its justification before God and men. Luther's error, which led to great practical abuse, lay in isolating the element of faith from life and from membership in the Church; on the other hand, some of his opponents departed equally from the Catholic doctrine in losing sight of the element of faith, or in obscuring it behind obedience

to the commands of the Church. But the demands for reform as set forth in the Articles upon Abuses, and afterwards formulated at Rome, were a very different matter. It was upon these more than upon doctrine that agreement was impossible, and even had they been satisfactorily disposed of there remained the fact that new religious bodies, distinct from the Church, had already been organised. Doctrines may be defined and qualified, ceremonies accommodated and refined, but schism, easy to bring into being, is a hard fact to get rid of, a step difficult to retrace.

The Diet at its close gave six months to the Protestants for reflection; during that time Confession and the Mass were to be allowed in their territories and no innovations were to be made. But a Council was to be held, and even yet great hopes were entertained as to its work. Meanwhile the Emperor was determined to enforce the Edict of Worms. His brother Ferdinand, who, although personally unpopular with the clergy, was deeply pledged to the Catholic cause, was now elected King of the Romans, and as such became a more influential person.

The immediate result of the Emperor's action was the formation by the Protestant princes of the defensive league of Smalkald (1530). But the pressure of the Turks, whose defeat before Vienna (1529) had brought merely temporary and unexpected relief to the Emperor, was great enough to prevent internal war, and the Peace of Nürnberg (1532) postponed the settlement of the religious difficulty. By this peace all the German princes were to help against the Turks, and in return religious prosecutions were to cease. It was also

**Peace of
Nürnberg,
1532.**

privately agreed that suits before the Imperial Court on account of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property should cease. The effect of political considerations was thus very apparent in Germany itself, and in these years of indecision the Protestants were led to turn, not only (as discontented princes had turned before) to France, but even to England, and still more strangely to the Papacy itself. For from a natural desire to avoid strengthening the Empire, the Papacy had to depend upon France: neither the Papacy nor France cared to see a council, which would be mainly Imperial in its authority and German in its constitution. Again and again, therefore, Clement, although pledged to a council, could plead the unwillingness of France: in Germany itself some of the Catholic princes—especially the Bavarian house—opposed the Emperor: had the Emperor been wholly free he would have dealt sternly with Lutheranism, while at the same time he would have tried to raise Catholicism everywhere to the spiritual level of earnestness and righteousness already reached in Spain. But it was to the interests neither of Pope nor Protestants that the Emperor should be free: both were led to depend upon his rival, France. Everything was political, and politics determined everything. There had been again and again men with opinions of a Lutheran type, with the same earnestness, with the same hatred of abuses, with the same disregard of unity, and the same readiness to shape a world anew. But never before—except in the prophetic case of Bohemia, where a religious leader had dexterously joined his religious movement with a national uprising—had political conditions tended to stereotype such a religious movement.

Princes, Kings, Emperors, Pope all now played with it as a counter in the game of politics: this was true of both the external and internal relations of Germany, and it was even truer when Protestantism spread to other lands. Clement VII. did not rise to the religious earnestness of Adrian VI., and his conception of his power was that of diplomacy and politics. He had been an Imperialist; he became a supporter of France; he had borne the lot of a prisoner, and the experience lessened such strength for action as he possessed. Reform, a deeper earnestness, rose a little higher in the College of Cardinals, a little nearer the Papacy itself, but it did not yet reach the greatest height of all. It was no wonder then that his Papacy saw the Western Church still further rent asunder.

Inside Germany, as we have seen, new religious bodies had been organised—Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Ansbach and Baireuth, Luneburg, Anhalt-
 Köthen, East Friesland, Schleswig-Holstein, Silesia, Prussia, and among the cities Nürn-
 berg, Magdeburg, Brunswick, Bremen, and Lübeck had all before 1531 adopted the Lutheran model with variations. A bold move of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse resulted in adding Württemberg to this number. Duke Ulrich had been banished in 1519, and his territory administered by the Imperial troops; the Duke's rule had been violent and reckless, but when (1534) the Landgrave attempted his restoration the old local loyalty proved itself strengthened by foreign rule. The campaign lasted little more than two months, and was ended June 29th, 1534, by the Treaty of Kadan; the Duke was restored, although under the nominal suzerainty of the Habsburg house, and was left free to

**Spread of
Lutheran-
ism.**

introduce the new religion which he had adopted in his exile; this he accordingly did. The treaty thus practically put an end to the scarcely observed convention that the princes who had secured toleration for their own territories should not attempt to extend their religion beyond. Even more important was the concession that the Imperial Court (Kammergericht) should no longer receive cases concerning the confiscation of Church property. Secularisation had long been a common thing in Germany: it had often been carried out by the Catholic princes; the Protestant princes thought it a hardship that they must give up the privilege merely because it entailed in their case, a diversion of the endowment, not only from the original owners, but also from the religion it had been meant to serve. The process of secularisation would now be easier. The geographical result of the treaty was to place a strong Protestant state in South Germany among the leading Catholic powers, and near the great sees of Würzburg, Salzburg, and Bamberg. About the same time the new religion was organised in Anhalt-Dessau, Pomerania, and the cities of Westphalia. In Münster it developed from 1531 onwards into the socialist and immoral Kingdom of John of Leyden and his Anabaptists: excesses as distasteful to one religious party as to the other were suppressed by both in union. But the inevitable result was to discredit change of any kind.

CHAPTER V

THE REFORMATION IN SCANDINAVIA AND FRANCE

BEYOND Germany the Reformation spread into the Scandinavian kingdoms. Here, again, politics made the course of change easier, and religion and politics became closely bound together. But while in Germany the course of the Reformation weakened the Imperial power and further divided the nation, in Scandinavia it resulted in a strengthening of the Crown. Christian I., of the house of Oldenburg, King of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, had found it hard to rule three dis-united countries; and Sweden (1501) became really independent, in spite of the royal claims. When his son Christian II. ascended the throne (1513) he found his power acceptable to the Danes, because his family was the nation's choice; in Norway—where he had ruled before his father's death—he faced a nobility proud and discontented; he had filled all offices with Danes: even the Archbishopric of Nidaros or Trondhjem (1510) had been by Papal help and against the Chapter's wish given to a Dane, Eric Valkendorf, while the Bishop of Hamar had been imprisoned for years. The Norwegians were thus left without a leader, but

their national spirit was still warm. Christian II., nephew of the Elector Frederic of Saxony, and married (1515) to Isabella, sister of Charles V., was rash, ambitious, and cruel. In Sweden he availed himself of a dispute between Gustav Trolle, Archbishop of Upsala, who had joined the Danish party, and the Stures, the national leaders; he established his power, but the massacre at Stockholm (November, 1520) of some hundred leading ecclesiastics and nobles aroused against him a national fury which led to the final freedom of Sweden. The excuse given that these deaths were the carrying out of a Papal excommunication was very transparent. This was the beginning of troubles, which, joined to Christian's ambition and the effect of the Reformation, split up the partly sundered North still further.

The Church in both Norway and Sweden, wealthy and aristocratic, in league with the nobles, had suffered from an isolation which, while against its vigour, had made it more national. The great wealth of the bishops (half of Denmark was said to belong to them), their foreign education (the University of Copenhagen, founded in 1478, was not yet important), and their ineffectual rule, invited attack. One outpost of Christianity—Greenland—had been all but lost; no bishop or priest had resided there for eighty years, and the sole relic of Christianity was a corporal, exhibited once a year, upon which a hundred years before the last priest had consecrated the Body of Christ. In Norway Archbishop Eric of Nidaros, however, was a wise ruler, and had circumstances allowed, the Church there, at any rate, might have kept its ground.

In Sweden, Gustavus Ericson, of the house of Vasa,

headed a national revolt; he escaped from Denmark, where he was a hostage (1518), and in just revenge for the Stockholm massacre roused the Dalecarlians to revolt; a two years' siege gave him possession of Stockholm, and finally (June 7th, 1523) he was elected King. But the nobles were jealous of him; the peasants, his chief supporters, were lawless; the commerce of the country was in the hands of the Hanseatic towns; he himself was heavily in debt. The Church, on the other hand—a preserve of the nobles—was rich, but the King's demands for money caused discontent at home and anger at Rome. The new Pope, Adrian VI., had sent an old pupil of his at Louvain, John Magnusson, a Swede by birth, and a Swedish canon, as Legate (1522). When he was elected Archbishop of Upsala his readiness to join Gustavus in the needed ecclesiastical reforms gave ground for hope. But Gustav Trolle, the old Archbishop, had merely fled, and was himself at Rome; a demand for his restoration led to threats on the King's part of a reformation carried out by his own power, and when (1526) Magnusson was finally confirmed by the Pope it was only after a quarrel between him and the King and when he was an exile. Both national and economic reasons now disposed Gustavus to a reform.

Meanwhile, Lutheranism had entered the country. Two Swedish students from Wittenberg, Olaf and Lars Peterssen, had returned home (1519), and their teaching, with its implied political possibilities, impressed the King, harassed by plots and difficulties as he was. Although endangered for a time by an Anabaptist movement, the

**Course of
Politics
and Reform
in Sweden.**

**Spread of
Lutheran-
ism.**

new doctrines made way; public disputations, the marriage of Olaf Peterssen, although a priest (1525), a projected translation of the Bible (1526), only completed for the New Testament and fully accomplished in 1540, emphasised their victory. In June, 1527, the Diet of Westerås met, and here the King expressed his need for a larger income to be gained from the monastic and episcopal lands. As Gustavus threatened abdication unless his demands were fulfilled, there was nothing to do but yield; it was hopeless to seek support, as the bishops did, in the Papal authority.

The Recess, drawn up by the Council, but published in the name of the Diet, placed all monastic, chapter, and episcopal lands at the King's disposal for confiscation or religious use: land not subject to taxation and given to the Church since 1454 returned to its former owners; all taxed lands, whenever given, did the same. The Word of God was to be the model for preachers; and a disputation, somewhat on the Zwinglian model, was to regulate all further points of importance. Subsequent ordinances gave the King the appointment of Church dignitaries and a general control over the Church. Henceforth, then, the bishops were under his control. The main object of the change had been the secularisation of Church property for State purposes; the consent of the nobles had been gained by the return (as mentioned above) to them of their old family gifts made to the Church. The royal control grew greater, and the Lutheranism of the now favoured religion was soon intensified when (1531) the Swedish Mass Book, Lutheran in doctrine, was published: compulsory

confession, and prayers for the dead were abolished, episcopacy continued although under royal visitation and with restricted powers. Gustavus' son and successor, Eric XIV. (1560-8), was a Calvinist by choice, and under him the Church and clergy became laxer and more careless. His brother and successor, John III., began a reaction, and with him the Counter-Reformation made some headway. On the whole, with the exception of the Dalecarlian peasants, the people followed the religious policy of Gustavus.

In Denmark, Christian aroused opposition : at length the rich and Lutheran city of Lübeck took up arms against him and supported his uncle and rival, Frederick, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein. **Denmark.**

Christian had, for political reasons, taken up the anti-clerical side of the Reformation, but doctrinal questions he was content to leave to the trading classes mostly influenced by German and Lutheran intercourse; these burghers and the peasants were thus his chief political supporters against the nobles. The clergy were heavily taxed, the nobles depressed in power; Codes, secular and religious, were issued (1521-2) by royal power. A Wittenberg theologian, Martin Reinhard, was asked over (1519), Luther was invited, but only Carlstadt came. The King's regulations were of a mixed type: monasteries were visited; priests were forbidden to be non-resident; ability to instruct was insisted upon as a qualification for minor orders; priests might marry, but must be chaste; cases of property were removed from spiritual courts, and a new royal court of appeal was set up at Roskilde, from which no appeal lay to the Pope. Christian's relations with the Papacy were thus strained, but the final success of Frederick

(1523) lessened his importance. He fled, and an attempt to regain his power as a Roman Catholic (1529) and through wars and negotiations (1531-2) only ended in his treacherous capture and imprisonment (until 1559).

In Frederick's own Duchies Lutheranism was already strong; the Danish clergy had therefore insisted upon his taking an oath neither to introduce it nor to injure the Church. But his temporary and cautious neutrality was in itself a gain to the Lutherans. Not only did he foresee the gain to the Crown from religious change, but he was himself a Lutheran at heart. Diets at Odensee (1526 and 1527) discussed the situation, but the King did much by his own power.

Clerical marriage was common and was recognised, but questions of doctrine were to remain until the meeting of a Council. Bishops were to get confirmation from the Archbishop of Lund, not from Rome: episcopal payments to the Pope were transferred to the Crown, as were also the fines inflicted by Church Courts; all these changes arose out of the vacancy of the See of Lund and a quarrel about it between King, Pope, and Chapter. But consecration being disregarded, the succession was gradually lost. The monasteries were deserted; in Norway and in Denmark the higher clergy were against the King; Christian's reconciliation with the Pope was a serious danger, and his landing (1531) secured him all except the fortresses. Foreign help from Lübeck and the Schmalkaldic League, however, maintained Frederick's power, and his recognition of Sweden's independence removed one cause of danger.

In Denmark, as elsewhere, there were some who

like Paul Eliaesen, Reinhard's interpreter, advocated a moderate reform—improved discipline, vernacular services, communion in both kinds, clerical marriage—with no doctrinal change. But Hans Tausen, the “Danish Luther,” educated at Wittenberg and returned home (1524), a married monk and popular preacher, headed a more extreme party, which made a large and unconsidered use of the New Testament (translated 1524). But the fact that the Reformation was so largely carried on by royal power, and not by popular tumult, resulted in the preservation to a larger extent than in Germany of ornaments such as the old altars and of vestments. The death of Frederick I. (April, 1533) and subsequent disputes between his sons Christian and John, while Lübeck fought for Christian II., changed the religious history. Had not Lübeck suffered a revolution in which Wullenwever, its great democratic leader, fell, and by which the Hanseatic towns lost much of their importance, the city might have gained on the Baltic the kind of power Zwingli had sought for Zürich in the South. In the end Christian III., the elder of Frederick's sons and a Lutheran, gained power in both Denmark and Norway, although many of the country districts in the latter remained Catholic. The Copenhagen Decree (1536) gave all ecclesiastical lands to the Crown; the secular members of the Council were henceforth to be Lutherans; the bishops, against whose order Christian had already as Duke of Schleswig-Holstein shown animosity, were removed and the episcopate abolished. Bugenhagen, the Lutheran organiser of Pomerania, was called in (1537) to draft a new constitution.

**Course of
Change.**

Seven superintendents (one of whom knew no Danish), with the place and even the name of bishops, **The Danish** were set apart by the laying upon them **Organisa-** of Bugenhagen's hands. Under the new **tion.** bishops were rural deans; nominally elected, both they and the bishops were largely chosen by the royal will. Side by side with the bishops stood financial officers representing the King, administering in his name the confiscated lands, and keeping the clergy under control. A liturgy was drawn up, and the gradual disuse of old ceremonies and institutions such as chapters and monasteries was hastened by the increasing local power of the nobles. The royal power, by its vigorous exercise, gave uniformity to the system: learning and theology were largely influenced from Germany, and the Augsburg Confession was the basis of doctrine. But there was little national vigour in the movement, and the policy of drifting along which was thus begun has prevented religion having the force in Denmark which in Sweden and even in disunited Germany it mostly possessed. The death of Christian III. (1559) saw Denmark Lutheran; Iceland had opposed the change bitterly, but was overcome: Norway had only tardily accepted it.

Into Norway Lutheranism was imported under Danish influence: monastic buildings were seized, and the bishops showed themselves feeble **Norway.** defenders of the Church. Christian III. (1536) placed the Kingdom under Denmark, and thus its civil and ecclesiastical independence disappeared altogether. The Archbishop of Nidaros and the Bishop of Hamar fled (1537); the Bishop of Stavanger was imprisoned; the Bishop of Oslo reappeared as a

Lutheran superintendent for Hamar and Oslo; the Bishop of Bergen became Superintendent of Stavanger and his own diocese. The old parish priests remained for the most part undisturbed, but were in the end succeeded by Lutherans, often foreigners, and of indifferent character and learning: for over fifty years the Kingdom suffered from religious revolution and ignorant pastors, but with the loss of political freedom she suffered sullenly, and it was long before the new teaching made itself at home.

The Scandinavian Reformation had thus some peculiar features of its own: clerical abuses had not been so prevalent, the Papacy did not count for as much as elsewhere: the doctrinal movement was imported and never very popular. The nobility was depressed, and the royal power raised as a result of the movement. Incidentally, trade, owing to its wider outlook and the lessened rivalry with the Baltic towns, flourished. Thus, when the spiritual connections with Germany had given Scandinavia a greater interest in German affairs, the royal powers were stronger, richer, and able to interfere with greater effect in the Thirty Years' War.

France, with a peculiar ecclesiastical past, had also in this period a distinct reforming movement of its own. The Reformation in France is, however, always associated with the history of Calvin, so influential outside France, and with the so-called "Wars of Religion." The influence of Calvin cannot be estimated too highly: the Wars of Religion had little or no permanent effect upon the world beyond complicating its politics, secular and ecclesiastical.

The Reformation and France.
The French Church before the Reformation.

The Pragmatic Sanction (1438) had defined the position of the Church in France: it may be taken as the joint result of the Conciliar Theory (for France had eagerly championed the independence of the Councils against the Popes) and of the strong monarchical power. Elections henceforth were to be made by the Chapters, but the King could recommend, and this meant, in practice, he would appoint. Papal reservations were restricted, and no appeals to Rome were permitted until the courts at home had been exhausted. By the Concordat of Bologna (1516) the appointment to ecclesiastical offices was given to the King: annates, previously all but abolished, were tacitly restored to the Pope. The Gallican Church had hitherto vindicated its liberty, but this meant that it was now under the control of the King, in whose favour the Pope had waived his rights. Henceforth the King was enabled to reward his favourites, and the evils of pluralities and non-residence were intensified. As regards discipline and religious life, France was as much in need of reform as other countries, and there, as elsewhere, earnest and educated men perceived the need. But the Reform movement in France began with the Renaissance: although the Sorbonne had been at one time the leading theological body of the West, it was such no longer, and the Thomist revival of theology as seen in Spain had not affected Paris: the Sorbonne was strictly conservative, orthodox but not progressive in doctrine. It was the Sorbonne that opposed Erasmus, and the condemnation of his Colloquies by it ensured the sale of 24,000 copies.

But the legal authorities were guided by the Sor-

bonne, and when, on the rise of Lutheranism, it named a Delegation on matters of Faith, the Parliament of Paris followed its lead: **Rise of Lutheranism.** heresy was, as in the Middle Ages, held a civil crime. But when Francis I., in the pursuit of Italian power, concluded the Concordat of Bologna to receive Papal support, the Parliament opposed this change. The versatile and unprincipled King, himself no heretic, although stained by many other crimes, was yet not prepared to follow the Parliament in its action against heresy, and thus at times appears as a favourer of what really threatened his throne and the unity of his Kingdom.

But it was not from Lutheranism that French Protestantism or Huguenotism arose. The clergy and schools were in close touch with the Church: the clergy were cultivated and leaders of the nation; it was among these and among the higher classes that the French movement began, and Reform was **Special origin of French Protestantism.** for some years more a sentiment than a cause of action. Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (Faber Stapulensis), an opponent of Erasmus in a controversy on the Pauline Epistles, was a professor of mathematics who turned to theology, and like Erasmus himself commented upon St. Paul's Epistles (1512), on the Gospels (1522), and translated, after an older version, the Bible into French (1523-8). He had been a teacher of Briçonnet, Abbot of St. Germain-des-Près, and when his friend went as Bishop to Meaux, he followed him thither by invitation (1516), as did Guillaume Farel also. At Meaux, Lefèvre and his pupils replaced the Cordeliers, and their preaching of Faith

as distinct from obedience to authority, their denunciation of celibacy and prayers in Latin, drew upon them the anger of the Sorbonne. But the protection of the King's sister, Margaret of Angoulême, Queen of Navarre, and of the King himself, saved them. Finally, however, stress of poverty and a grant from the clerical notables, on condition of his suppressing Lutheranism, led the latter to sanction persecution (1526). But Farel, among the Reformers, had gone too far for Briçonnet in his doctrine, especially in denouncing prayers for the dead, and thus the party of Reform went different ways. Provincial synods, especially at Sens, now (1527-8) took up, as did Briçonnet himself, the twofold policy of suppressing Lutheranism and furthering moderate reforms.

But the movement now began to change slightly its character. There were still the Court preachers, most of them men of good family, protected by Margaret. But Germany now began to influence France, and the German Protestants, to whom Francis was politically favourable, negotiated as was their wont. The brothers Du Bellay, one of whom was Bishop of Paris, held a mediate position, and Guillaume du Bellay conducted negotiations with Melanchthon. Thus favour and fire alternated fitfully as Francis changed his mood (1534). In 1535 the Huguenot schism began when at Paris they founded a separate place of worship, and thus the stamp of opposition to Church and Crown alike was placed upon the movement. It was no longer an attempt to reform the Church (indeed, the vigour of the persecution at times made the hope of such a thing seem vain): it was a movement of separation

**Change
of the
Movement.**

which at Paris and elsewhere in the cities (for the country places remained Catholic) demanded toleration and safety. Thus the course of the religious movement in France was very different from elsewhere: it originated in the Renaissance and biblical study; its Lutheran associations were secondary and purely sympathetic; its treatment depended upon kingly and party politics; it was very largely an affair of literature, sermons, and psalm-singing until the popular enthusiasm and iconoclasm of some of its followers alienated men like Rabelais. A curious feature in the literary war was the publication (1544) by the Sorbonne of an *Index Expurgatorius*, which was continued annually. But when violence on the part of its promoters and persecution on the part of the authorities were becoming more marked, the sinister genius of Calvin appeared, and henceforth, whatever might be the play of politics and parties, French Protestantism and Calvinism meant the same thing.

John Calvin was born, as were Lefèvre and Berquin (a leading martyr of the movement), in Picardy. His father, a lawyer himself, in the end meant his son to be the same, and his earlier studies at Paris were followed by legal courses at Orleans and Bourges. In 1533 he was, however, again at Paris; and now his humanist and legal phase developed, under reforming influence, into a theological one: he had to flee from Paris, and (1534) appears at Basel, the old home of Erasmus until reform grew violent, and the field of work of the gentle radical *Æcolampadius* (†1531). In the interval between this date and his arrival at Geneva (1536) Calvin wrote his *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, a

Calvin,
1509-64.

work which grew through successive editions from six chapters to eighty, and embodied the relentless growth of his logical mind and rigid system. Legal order and logical completeness it had from the first, although his

peculiar tenets of "Calvinism" might be stated more fully in later editions: thought, clear and revolutionary, it expressed most impressively. In later days it was a textbook wherever the Reformed religion spread.

It lacked the vivid personal experiences which had given Luther's words their power, but when illustrated by the polity he created at Geneva it had more lasting influence upon the world than any writing of any other Reformer. In its French form it played a great part in French literature: its preface was, as Zwingli's *Professio Fidei*, significantly addressed to Francis I. From Geneva, French in its sympathy but independent in its position, he was able to dominate France, and to influence Europe both through France and independently.

Geneva, where the energetic Farel had laboured since 1532, stood between Savoy and Bern. Against

the rule of its bishop leaning upon the Duke of Savoy, his advocate, its democracy looked for help to Bern—reformed in a Zwinglian sense (1528), but at a later date more Lutheran—and (1526–30) had at last set up a republic. Internal strife and external troubles lasted, however, until (1536) Catholicism was abolished. The Bishop was driven out; sermons replaced the daily Mass; ordinary bread was used in the Eucharist, and a strict moral discipline—something on the Zwinglian lines—was introduced. This was the field to which Calvin was called, and

where, after a short absence due to civic strife (1538–40), he lived until his death (1564). Here, too, he introduced the ecclesiastical organisation, largely original, although much indebted to Zwingli, which was, perhaps, next to the Catholic model, most calculated to maintain itself and to impress righteousness upon a wayward people. The transformation of Geneva from a city noted for immorality to one noted for its austere piety is proof that his system possessed this quality.

Luther might start from a vivid personal experience; Zwingli from a humanism modified by local politics; Calvin—as became a lawyer and a logician—followed another method. Like them, he disregarded all previous theology (the sixteenth century was not, indeed, a theological age), but unlike them he went on to build up a theory of religion and life upon the sovereignty of God, for his theology was the basis of his polity to a greater degree than was the case with any Reformer, Catholic or Protestant. It was emphatically a legal conception, and man as the subject of God's law fell into his destined place. As did the Catholic Reformers, so he too went back to S. Augustine; but they, as became Thomists, seized on those conceptions of S. Augustine which fitted in with the Catholic faith and existing worship: he went back to the predestination side of S. Augustine's views, and upon this conception of law—the law of God, guiding and inspiring man as God's instrument for a destined work—Calvin based his teaching and his polity. It is a magnificent testimony to the breadth and force of S. Augustine's teaching that both the Catholic Reformers of Spain, who later on were the leading theo-

**Doctrinal
basis of his
system.**

logians of Trent, and Calvin himself, were indebted to him for the most vital parts of these divergent schemes.

In regard to the Eucharist, Calvin agreed with Zwingli in denying any bodily presence or any change of substance; unlike Zwingli, he held there
The Eucharist. was a real spiritual grace given, a real union with Christ made; but these benefits were purely spiritual and connected with the Sacrament itself, rather than with the consecrated elements. It was on this view that the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), following upon Calvin and Bullinger's work, the generally accepted "Consensus Tigurinus" (1549) was based, and so finally and expressly united Switzerland.

While Zwingli gave the power of excommunication to the State, Calvin kept it for the religious body
Organi- sation and Discipline. itself in the Consistory. The pastors had an almost unrestricted power ("new presbyter was but old priest writ large"), it was for them to preach, teach, and administer the Holy Eucharist (with a ritual which was Zwinglian in its plainness). The pastors along with elected laymen formed the Consistory which exercised the moral discipline. It was in this association of the pastors, and in the strict supervision thus carried out, that the organic strength of the new system lay. It was a theocracy under God in which the ministers, His messengers, had the upper hand, and controlled even the State itself. It fitted in well with a democracy in politics, and hence it spread so as ultimately to absorb Zwinglianism in Switzerland and elsewhere; in France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and very largely in England, in districts of Germany, such as the Palatin-

ate, it was "the Reformed" not the "Lutheran" type of Protestantism that had power.

In his later years the influence of Calvin reached far and wide; as a sort of Protestant Pope he received questions for decision, and wrote to sovereigns upon equal terms; his views governed a large territory of Protestant thought; and, until early in the seventeenth century an Arminian revival began, Protestant orthodoxy was judged by agreement with him. Such a large body of opinion affected thought beyond Protestant circles, and the tendency of speculation as Calvinism rose, and as it declined, was naturally towards the larger questions of God's government of the universe and the free-will or the limited power of man.

The religious history of France, when, after 1550, French Protestants were Calvinists, can be best treated here. For many reasons the Huguenots were opposed to the Crown; whether as led by great nobles of royal blood, or as demanding toleration and almost sovereignty in special districts and cities, or as a schism against a church dominated by the King, or as theoretical republicans, they took to opposition easily. But how far the Crown by its persecution or its energetic measures made their opposition active depended upon its mood, its policy, and its advisers. There was always Spain, the national enemy, to be reckoned with, and after the revolt of the Netherlands (1572) opposition to Spain was inevitable: there were Popes of Spanish and French leanings to deal with; there were German Protestants to conciliate or delude; after a time there were armed camps, the League led by the

Calvin's influence in later years.

Religion in France.

Guise family, and the Huguenots, the triumph of either meaning ruin to the nation; that of the former, meaning Spanish influence, that of the latter, the reversal of all the nation's past. But the main interest of these wars is political, not in any sense religious. At the outset of the wars the moderate part of the nation was against the Huguenots; after the massacre of S. Bartholomew, 1572, it was rather against the Catholics; about 1585 a Catholic reaction began.

These wars filled the history of France from 1559 to 1598. At an early date there was an attempt at a compromise in the Colloquy of Poissy (September, 1561). It was estimated, probably

**Periods of
the Wars.**

with exaggeration, that the Huguenots and their sympathisers numbered more than one quarter of the population, and many prelates would have welcomed some effective compromise. But political parties made for war, and used religion as a pretext. The Huguenots were the better organised. Their first synod had been held (May, 1559); the Calvinist organisation had been adopted already in the separate congregations giving them incidentally an organisation for war or revolt; it only remained to bind them into groups (called Colloquies: the classes of the English Presbyterians), and so constitute a synod for the united body. A Confession of Faith, which was mainly composed by Calvin, was also adopted. Thus the alternatives were clear before the King and all those present at Poissy. Theodore Beza, the most aristocratic of Reformers, and Peter Martyr were among the Protestants; six cardinals, forty prelates, and Lainez, now General of the Jesuits, represented the Church. As was mostly the case politics, represented by Catharine de Medici, were

inclined to a compromise; but theology, adequately represented by Lainez, opposed it. The views of the Protestants on the Eucharist when formulated for decision were naturally and decisively rejected by the bishops. It is impossible to follow in detail the varying decrees by which the Protestants received legal recognition and a toleration varying, both under Francis I. (†1547) and Henry II. (1547–59), with the political situation. But the massacre of S. Bartholomew (1572) will always remain one of the best-known crimes of a religious name. Henry of Navarre was to marry the King's sister, Margaret, and all the notables were therefore gathered together in Paris; Coligny, the Admiral, had gained over the young King Charles the Ninth an influence of which his mother, Catharine de Medici, was jealous: a plot to assassinate him in her interests failed; because of the King's anger, and, as a secondary move, a general massacre of Huguenots was hastily resolved upon; Catharine, in league with her usual opponents, the Guises, planned it, and the King was induced to consent. Terrible as the crime was, no outside power—neither the Papacy nor Spain—was concerned; it not only shocked the world, with the exception of many bigots, but it brought after it a strengthening of the Huguenot movement by which, when the great leaders had disappeared and the faint-hearted had changed sides, the democratic Calvinistic rank and file became the heart of the movement and directed its policy. The war henceforth became one for the existence of the Huguenots, a war more of parties than of creeds. Spain—gradually under Philip II. looming forth as the great Catholic power—sees its opportunity, and by the encouragement of the League

tries not only to restore Catholicism in full, but to reduce France to a province of Spain. The Papacy, even under so able a Pope as Sixtus V., finds itself forced by politics now to side with the Crown, and now against it. The Guises—one of the ablest of families in war, diplomacy, and intrigue, as cardinals or generals, and sometimes as both together—were reduced to seeking Spanish help for objects which were at first religious and then afterwards ambitious.

As the war itself becomes more confused and more political than religious, parties group themselves more plainly. The League, begun with a union of the nobles of Picardy (1576), was a complete organisation for the restoration of Catholicism, placed at the service of its elected leader; a later and like association was formed in Paris (1584), and the Duke of Guise, with Spanish help behind him, controlled the party machine. The crown was completely overshadowed, and not even the treacherous murders by Henry III. of the Duke of Guise and his brother, the Cardinal (1588), could restore the royal power. Meanwhile, Henry of Navarre—the Huguenot heir to the throne—was growing into a greater man; there was in the eyes of patriotic Frenchmen little against him except his religion, and that sat somewhat easily upon a Huguenot as romantic and as licentious as Francis I. himself. When (1593), after long hesitation, he took the Mass to gain a kingdom, the end of the war was in sight, and it only needed his appearance as the national champion against Spain (1595–98) to make him in reality the national King. The great conservative body of the nation—which was now Catholic, and weary of war—grouped

**Later
stages of
the War,
1584–98.**

itself around him; and it was they—not the League representing the Counter-Reformation and aggressive Catholicism, and still less the Huguenots,—that gained the victory; and the King was well adapted to them and their religious sympathies. This is the reason why France, in later years, seems less affected by the Counter-Reformation, the influence of which is described elsewhere (Chapter VIII.), than other countries were. It was an evil thing for a nation to have been rent by wars covered by the name of religion; the French wars did more than any others to accustom the world to the idea of religious wars, and thus to secularise religion itself. Henceforth, with Germany divided in itself, with the Netherlands in revolt, with France at civil war, with England divided by Puritan and Anglican parties called after Parliament and King, religion and war seemed naturally allied; there was thus a general loss of spirituality. It was not the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) that alone was the issue at arms of religious difference, for these earlier wars had taught the world the same lesson before.

In a politic sense, Henry IV., who had forced the Papacy to recognise him as King (it was not until 1595 that Clement VIII. gave him absolution), might be the type of Gallican independence; he, and still more Lewis XIV., could afford to treat the Pope without much deference, and mainly as a political power. There was even talk of a French Patriarchate and a modified religion. But the monarchy was stronger than either the national Church or the Papacy, and could play off one against the other. The Jesuits, too, as a foreign body, depended upon the King's favour, and were often of great use to him.

The religious settlement made by the Edict of Nantes (April, 1598), recognised, as was inevitable
1598. after the wars, with their many treaties,
Edict of the existence of the Huguenots as a separ-
Nantes. ate body; their service was allowed (with the exception of Paris, Rheims, Dijon, Toulouse, and five miles around them) wherever it had been held before 1597; they could hold their fortresses for eight years as security for their rights; offices of State were open to all subjects, and the Parliaments of Paris and elsewhere had special and evenly composed sides for dealing with the cases of the Reformed. The Catholics had the free use of their religion everywhere, and hence in many districts, whence they had been dispossessed with violence, a restoration of Catholicism followed, and everywhere it kept or regained the tithes. Thus the edict, in itself more of a treaty than a general toleration, contained the seed of future strife: the restricted recognition of Huguenotism meant that it only existed at the royal will; the moderate Catholic party had been consolidated; the few really spiritual persons, left by the exhausting wars, were on their side; all the political power lay with the King; Protestantism had weakened and divided the State, not conquered it as in Scandinavia. But schemes of disendowment, which had been mooted, had left a disquieting effect behind, and the national division was not to be permanent. France and the French Crown took their own way of dealing with the problem of religious toleration as affecting political unity; and being in France that way was violent and despotic.

CHAPTER VI

GERMANY AFTER 1529

ON September 25th, 1534, Clement VII. died, and was succeeded, after a Conclave of one day only, by Alexander Farnese—Paul III. The new Pope, although only sixty-seven years old, had been a cardinal for forty years, and had narrowly escaped the Papal throne before. He was a patron of art and literature, easy and liberal in his views, and generous in his treatment of men: pledged to no party in politics, and by both person and tastes alike fitted for a dignified position. But he could not be reckoned an ecclesiastic or a theologian above everything else. Yet he came to the throne when the greatness of the “German tragedy” was thoroughly felt: he was soon surrounded through his own choice by cardinals of a more deeply religious tone, and for some years it seemed as if the Papal administration was to be conducted in a very different way.

**Paul III.,
1534-49.**

In Italy there had at length been a reaction from the Paganism, secret or avowed, of the Renaissance; “the Oratory of Divine Love” had been formed at Rome (1523) with the objects of prayer, biblical study, and edification. Giberti, Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV.), and some fifty others, many of them equally eminent, were its

**Thought
in Italy.**

members. The movement aimed at the reform, not as older movements had done of monastic life, but of clerical. Its significance was, however, greater than its effect, for the sack of Rome (1527) scattered its members. It was characteristic that it embraced men of opposite extremes; but, broadly speaking, they were all united in a strong assertion of justification by faith—a doctrine which, however technically expressed and often erroneously emphasised to the exclusion of other truths, embodies the great principle that man is judged by God as what he essentially is.

Venice, to which in the political storm all people—Italians or refugees, such as Reginald Pole—flocked, became a centre of this newer school of thought. Here the whole Bible was translated into Italian; here, too, Contarini, eminent in intellect as well as in piety, was laying in a small field that foundation of thought and observation which is the best preparation for a lofty office. In Modena, again, the Bishop Giovanni de Morone taught the same doctrines, and brought into strong light the doctrine and the person of Christ. At the same time all these men held along with Erasmus to the unity of the Church and obedience to the Papacy. The latter presented itself as the most stable among the unstable political powers of Italy, and had, of course, gathered around itself the ecclesiastical sentiments of the West. “No corruption,” said one of these biblical students, “can be great enough to justify a defection from the Church. Were it not better for each to try and reform what exists than to experiment in creating something new? It were well to bend all our thoughts to improving the old institution and curing its defects.”

It was noteworthy that on his accession Paul III. called to the College of Cardinals, Caraffa, Sadoleti, Pole, Giberti, and Contarini—all men of the type described and eager for reform. Commissions for reform in the several departments of the administration—the Camera, the Rota, the Chancery, and the Penitentiaries—were formed and preparations begun for the Council which might, as it seemed, yet restore unity, and the outlook in Germany for the moment justified such a hope.

**The new
Cardinals.**

Even the Protestants had drawn together among themselves: under the influence of Melanchthon the adherents of the Augsburg Confession and the party of the Oberland under Bucer—who, eager for compromise, hurried from one leader to another to minimise their differences—had agreed upon a common profession (the Wittenberg Concord, 1536); even the Zwinglians approached them, although not closely enough to agree absolutely or heartily. The cessation of war with France (June, 1538) and the pressure of the unceasing Turks made the Emperor better disposed towards the Protestants, and thus the Diet of Regensburg (Ratisbon) in April, 1541, gave hopes of national union. Friendly discussions at Worms (January, 1541) between theologians, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Calvin on one side, Eck, Cochlaeus, and Gropper on the other, preceded the Diet; four days' argument upon Original Sin had resulted in a compromise, when the proceedings were postponed to the Diet: von Pflug, a moderate and learned theologian, now strengthened the Catholics, and Cardinal Contarini (whose presence was a pledge of reform) appeared as Legate: a series of articles

**Diet and
Colloquy
at Regens-
burg, 1541.**

(the Liber Ratisbonensis) laid down by Gropper after long consultation became the basis of negotiation in place of the Augsburg Confession: after much disagreement, Eck and Melancthon rejected the 5th Article upon Justification, while Luther also had previously declared the whole unsatisfactory; but even upon this point an agreement was finally reached. Justification by faith was asserted, but this faith was viewed as in itself a starting-point for a life of holiness, and the two elements were not to be separated. To use the technical term, Justification by faith was the germ of the *justicia inhaerens* (inherent righteousness), and this issued in the *fidem efficacem per caritatem* (faith working through love). This view, which became a standard for the moderate and mediating Catholics, made the imputed righteousness which produced the inherent righteousness the important element: hence Divine Grace had a larger share in man's securing salvation than had his own good works. The Jesuit fathers at Trent, on the other hand, while giving to the imputed righteousness the priority in time made the inherent righteousness of man himself, produced by the other, the more important element: in their scheme the larger share belonged to man's free will and works of merit. This was a vital difference, not in philosophy only, but in actual life as well. The Consistory at Rome, however (May 27th, 1541), rejected the article on account of its exclusion of human merit; Luther, equally firm in his personal views, considered it a "patched up" thing, needing for completeness an acknowledgment of previous error on the Catholic side, and an assertion of his own views as to justification by faith alone.

But at the Colloquy it proved easy to agree upon the Sacraments generally, upon Ordination, Baptism, and Confirmation: while upon the Holy Eucharist, Absolution, and the Marriage of Priests, agreement naturally proved impossible. The Emperor would have liked to make the accepted Articles a kind of creed for the Empire—a step similar in substance to that taken further on by the Interim—but Contarini protested, and Luther, never lacking in the common-sense that so often accompanies self-will, rejected the proposal. But even had a satisfactory agreement been reached upon the points discussed there would still have remained the question of the Papal Power, and here any agreement must have been impossible. The Colloquy, although dictated largely by political needs, had, however, been a Christian effort, and even if little came of it, each party had seen something of the mind of the others. The discussion moreover and the clearer expression of Catholic doctrine greatly influenced theology of all types.

Before the Diet broke up a Recess was agreed upon by which a truce was established through an Imperial Declaration. The Catholic bishops were to **Recess of** press forward the reformation of discipline: **Regens-** the Peace of Nürnberg was renewed and **burg, 1541.** also the Augsburg Recess: pending the assembly of a Council and of another Diet in eighteen months, Lutherans received protection for all ecclesiastical property they held: assessors from among them were admitted to the Kammergericht (the Imperial Court): their "reformation" of monasteries and their secularisation of monastic and capitular funds was legalised for the time. Charles' scheme of national

union was thus seen to be hopeless; he was driven to work by political agencies to secure the two objects nearest to his heart—the consolidation of a reformed Church and the unity of the Empire. But he slowly came to the conclusion that against the Lutherans force was his only remedy. With many people before and since he regarded belief and opinion as secondary to practice and conduct: he was equally ready to leave shades of difference to be fought over by theologians subject to his royal decision: he could see that reform was not only inevitable but desirable: he saw, moreover, that the only way to gain it and make it acceptable was by a Council: if a General Council could not meet, a German Council, at any rate, could, and for his purpose the latter at least was essential. But the Pope looked at the matter from a different point of view: he was not so much bent upon reform as was Charles, and he probably had a truer estimate of the obstacles formed by theological differences. Nor was the condition of Germany—for any improvement in which religious accord was needed—of vital moment to him. Hence for some years after 1541 the summoning of a General Council is the pivot upon which ecclesiastical affairs chiefly turned.

In 1542 war broke out between France and the Emperor, ended only by the Peace of Crépy in 1544. In Germany leagues had been forming; the Imperial Chancellor von Held had formed a league of Catholic princes (the Nürnberg Bond, June 10th, 1538): the Emperor had granted the Lutherans toleration, at any rate, for the time. Meanwhile, Protestantism made such strides forward that in all Lower Germany only Duke Henry of Brunswick-

**Charles
and a
Council.**

**Politics in
Germany,
1542-55.**

Wolfenbüttel remained Catholic. But events worked together to give the Emperor increasing power. The bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse (March, 1540), for which Luther and Melanchthon with other reformers were responsible, both shocked public opinion and put this capable politician in danger of the Imperial ban. Not only was Protestantism discredited, but Philip had to give up his diplomatic schemes against Charles and to make his peace at any price.

Furthermore, a disputed succession in the Duchy of Cleve divided the princes, and thus became of importance. Charles, Duke of Gelders—**Succession to Cleve and Gelders.** Charles' most determined enemy—had never gained recognition from him, and (1534) had formally yielded his territory to France. **Spread of Protestantism generally.** His subjects, however, wished John of Cleve to be his successor, and (1538) the latter's son, William, was recognised as heir. On the death of the Duke of Gelders William easily gained possession of the lands, and on his father's death (1539) held Cleve and Gelders together. The Emperor claimed Gelders as a reverted fief, but as William's sister, Sibylla, was married to the Elector, John Frederick of Saxony, some members of the Smalkaldic League were likely to rally to his support, and a new cause of discord was thus found. Further to the west, Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, the Catholic leader of the North, had gained an Imperial Decree against the ancient town of Goslar for having destroyed some monasteries. When he refused to put off the execution of the Decree the Smalkaldic League began war against him, drove him from his territories, and introduced Lutheranism there (1542). The

Palatinate (1545) and the city of Regensburg also became Protestant now. Archbishop Hermann (von Wied), of Köln, not only showed leanings towards Protestantism, but tried, with the help of Bucer and Melancthon, to introduce it into his dominions (1536-42). His defection would have given the Protestants a majority in the College of Electors and would have stiffened the ecclesiastical opposition along the Rhine and northwards. Here the successful claimant, William of Cleve and Gelders, had introduced in his territories an eclectic reformation: Catholic in doctrine and organisation, but allowing communion in both kinds—a concession the Venetian envoy, Guistiniani (1540-41), considered necessary if Germany was to be preserved Catholic. William, however, soon became decisively Lutheran (1542), just before the Emperor's attack upon him changed the fate of Northern Germany (1543). Philip of Hesse, to keep Charles' favour, had opposed the admission of William into the Smalkaldic League, which other members favoured. The League being thus divided, Charles was able to defeat William, wrest Gelders from him—thus joining to the Burgundian Netherlands what would otherwise have remained a purely German Duchy—and reintroduce Catholicism in William's lands. As a consequence, Protestantism in Köln fell also. But in the North, where Saxony and Brandenburg had power, most of the Sees were in secular hands; it was as yet only towards the Rhine that Protestantism was weakened. "We are daily becoming fewer," said the Catholic Cochlaeus.

But with a stronger position and now at peace with France (September, 1544) Charles turned again to

attempt a religious and political peace in Germany. Some Protestant theologians were ready to help him, but Luther, in a coarse but effectual way, gave his view of the obstacles to it in his treatise *Against the Papacy founded by the Devil at Rome*, issued the very month (March, 1545) when the Council was to meet. A second religious Colloquy at Regensburg (1546) had no result; the Protestant princes refused to accept the decisions of the Council. But Protestantism was now divided by the very policies that had smoothed its earlier path. Duke Maurice of Albertine or Ducal Saxony (1541-53), son-in-law of Philip of Hesse, had been since 1542—both on his father-in-law's account and because of his jealousy of Electoral Saxony—an ally of the Emperor's: Joachim II., in Brandenburg, had carried out changes (1538-43) which gradually became more extreme, but he, too, in opposition to Saxony, stood apart from the Smalkaldic League and followed the Emperor's policy. Thus when (December, 1545) the long-expected Council met the spread of Protestantism had gone beyond its political power; the Emperor had never been stronger; he judged this the time to use again the weapon of arms that had answered so well against Cleve. The Pope regarded the coming war as partly religious—an aspect Charles was not wishful to give it publicly: he sent Charles money and troops and allowed him to seize for its expenses Church revenues in Spain. The Smalkaldic League was taken at a disadvantage, and the South German cities were isolated. The Elector, John Frederick of Saxony, was defeated at Mühlberg (April 24th, 1547): the Landgrave of Hesse surrendered

Growing
power of
Charles V.

Divisions
in the
Smalkaldic
League.

at Halle (June, 1547), and thus the two leading Protestant princes were prisoners. Maurice received much of his uncle's lands and became Elector of Saxony in his place: the Archbishop of Köln, Hermann, had resigned his See (February 25th, 1547); Catholic bishops were restored elsewhere. The power of the Emperor—resting mainly upon the support of Maurice—was supreme. All the great Protestant cities surrendered, some on promise of toleration, and the Duke of Württemberg followed suit. And further Duke Henry was restored in Brunswick. Except in the further north, Charles was supreme: his triumph meant the success of Catholicism.

In the Diet at Augsburg (September, 1547, to 1548) the Emperor attempted a religious settlement: he was now out of friendship with the Pope, whose nephew Pierluigi Farnese had been (September, 1547) murdered with the supposed connivance of Charles' governor at Milan. The Council had been moved, against his wish, from Trent to Bologna, and Charles was therefore more inclined to act by himself. His plan of settlement, the Augsburg Interim (May, 1548) was drawn up by Pflug and Helling on the Catholic side, and John Agricola on the Protestant side: it was to serve provisionally until a Council could carry out reforms: in doctrine it was mainly Catholic, but it conceded clerical marriage, and communion in both kinds where it had been customary; on the other hand, episcopacy, the power of Councils, the primacy of Rome limited so as not to trench upon the rights of bishops, the Invocation of Saints, the seven Sacraments, the Mass as a true sacrifice—all these were asserted

against innovators: justification was defined as the process by which a man is made just, and on such points as the encouraging of communicants at daily Mass there was an endeavour to meet a changing opinion. A Formula of Reform for the Catholic States prepared by Pflug (now Bishop of Naumburg) was also published and adopted by many diocesan synods. The Protestant States received the document in varying ways: some approved; others, like Maurice of Saxony, hesitated; Maurice himself consulted the theologians, and a modified form—the Leipzig Interim (December 24th, 1548)—was the result. By

this document the lesser importance of ritual and ceremonies was asserted; but the controversy which arose as to the definition of these adiaphora (things indifferent) had a long history in Protestant theology. In its doctrine the Leipzig form was conciliatory: man's justification was declared to be solely due to the merits of Christ, but his conduct was not to be supposed mechanically controlled by God: the Mass was continued, but, as was favoured by reformers, canticles in the vernacular were to be sung during its celebration (in England the Puritans in the same way sang Psalms); the assertion of episcopal control was not in accordance with Lutheran practice. It was in the discussion of this form that Melanchthon somewhat threw over the authority of Luther (†February 18th, 1546).

The Protestants affected to believe that the Interim was to bind the Catholics also: Charles, who was on this occasion less straightforward than usually, meant it as a limit to change. While the States varied in their views, the cities emphatically repudiated the

The
Leipzig
Interim:
the Adia-
phora.

Interim. In South Germany it was forced upon them, and their pastors became exiles: in the North, Magdeburg was a centre for fugitive theologians, by many of whom Melanchthon was fiercely attacked: Philip-pists, Gnesio-Lutherans, and Lutherans fought a many-sided duel. The Pope condemned the Interim; and it was indeed an exercise of regal power commoner in Catholic Spain, Protestant Scandinavia, or in England than in Germany. But in spite of the general unrest, diplomacy helped the Interim to survive. Even Pope Paul III., in view of a possible reunion, hinted at concessions as to clerical marriage and communion in both kinds. His successor, Julius III., worked more harmoniously with Charles, and when (May, 1551) the Council of Trent met again, several Protestants humoured the Emperor by attendance: Brandenburg, with an eye upon secularised sees, Württemberg, and Saxony sent representatives, while the Protestant theologians prepared statements of faith. But the demands that these theologians should be admitted to vote, that the Council should begin *de novo*, and that the bishops should be for the time free from Papal control were very sweeping. It did seem, however, as if concord were possible: it was a possibility which a subsequent crystallisation of doctrine and the fixed bareness for the most part of later Protestant worship leads us to underestimate. As we pass, however, in a city like Nürnberg from Catholic to Lutheran churches, the possibility mounts higher in our view, for the present buildings show us that the conditions of worship must at that time have been more fluid. But whatever the possibility was, the conduct of Maurice made it vanish.

The Elector Maurice was well-nigh the ablest, and certainly the selfishest, of princes when ability was rare and selfishness common. Charles' mingling of coercion in Germany and toleration at Trent might lay him open to suspicion; but the treachery of Maurice needs a better excuse than this. A sudden treaty with France, a hasty march southwards, laid his benefactor Charles at his mercy, and made him a fugitive (1552). The Council at Trent broke up, and the Treaty of Passau marked the failure of the Interim.

Maurice of Saxony.

Treaty of Passau,
Aug. 2,
1552.

By this Treaty Philip of Hesse was set at liberty: until the next Diet an amnesty in religious matters was to obtain: this Diet was to settle how, whether by Council, by Recess, or a Colloquy, reform was to be secured. Maurice was bent upon gaining for Lutheranism a legal recognition irrespective of Trent or any other Council: Charles had to own his own weakness, but would neither give up the unity of the Empire nor the hope of ultimate unity. Had he acted otherwise, the Catholic cause in Germany would have been nearly lost. His war against France, however, went badly, and in 1553 he left Germany for good: the same year Maurice lost his life in a fight against his former ally, the lawless Margrave Albert of Brandenburg (July 9th, 1553). Ferdinand was left to make a lasting peace, for Charles could not bring himself, faithful Catholic as he was, to legalise the work of Luther.

In February, 1555, the Diet which was to settle the religious future of Germany met at Augsburg: the bulk of the Protestant princes had previously agreed to maintain the Augsburg Confession, irrespective

of discussion or compromise: Ferdinand would have preferred a compromise that would retain the appearance, at least, of religious unity: the Lutherans demanded for the future full liberty to secularise Church property, and a protection for their adherents in Catholic States which was not to be given to Catholics under Protestant princes. It was obvious how closely the cause of Protestantism was bound up with the cause of princes against control from Emperor or Church. In the end all Lutheran princes received security: the principle *cujus regio, ejus religio* was thus set up inside the Empire: dissenting subjects were free to emigrate: in Lutheran lands episcopal authority was surrendered: the *reservatum ecclesiasticum* provided that in future bishops becoming Lutherans should forfeit their territory. This provision, although in the Recess, was really disregarded by the Lutherans, and its feeble enforcement was one cause of the Thirty Years' War. A royal declaration apart from the Recess promised liberty of faith to Lutherans in the states ruled by bishops: in the free Imperial cities (where Protestants mainly prevailed) minorities were to be respected.

This was a peace due to weariness of strife, and not to any recognition of principles. If the adherents of the Augsburg Confession (it was not specified which of the many recensions was the model) gained recognition, it was due to the personal influence of Luther and the policy of princes: but their creed gained no sanction more than that of the Reformed which gained no recognition. Thus the Peace recognised the differences of Protestants as well

Religious
Peace of
Augsburg,
Sept. 25,
1555.

Defects of
the Peace.

as their power. On the other hand, it conceded to the princes the rightfulness of secularisation in the past while denying it in the future. It did not thus set up as a principle the inviolability of Church lands. It gave up the chance of regaining the secularised sees, which Pope Paul IV., for instance, would have gladly regained: on the other hand, it preserved the sees that still remained. It was a peace which neither side welcomed but both accepted until their weariness was past and their wish to infringe it freshly roused. It recognised the breakdown of unity, Imperial and Ecclesiastical, and so far it recognised facts sad but undeniable. If it was a Peace that contained the seeds of war (as every peace really does), it had at least been made by Germany alone. Neither Pope (the Papal legate Morone had refused to be a party to it) nor Council nor intrusive State such as France had aught to say in it. Moreover, it was the work of princes and politicians who saw the need for peace: the theologians were left outside, and continued to wrangle with increasing violence.

The year of the Peace (1555) marks the height of the success of Protestantism. Other causes were now working against it, and its own divisions were telling in the same direction. Electoral and Ducal Saxony, Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, Brandenburg (both electoral and Ansbach), Württemberg, the Palatinate, nearly all Brunswick, Hesse, Anhalt, and nearly all the cities were either Lutheran or Reformed. Elsewhere in Catholic states, as Austria or Bavaria, many of the nobles and lower classes were also Protestant. But a reaction, not altogether due to force or persecu-

**Progress of
Lutheran-
ism.**

tion, was soon to begin, and to win back for Catholicism some whole states and many individual Protestants elsewhere. The main cause of this reaction was that the Church had risen to a truer sense of its mission and of the imperfections that had hindered its accomplishment.

CHAPTER VII

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

THERE had long been a demand for a General Council; the Lateran Council (1512-17) had just done enough to show that another Council might do more; not only the ever scantier supporters of the conciliar theories, but the more earnest theologians looked for it. Luther's appeal to a General Council and the hope that it might possibly conciliate some Protestants were to some people further reasons for calling it. As early as November, 1526, the summoning of such an assembly had been discussed, and Charles—both as Emperor and as a private Catholic—was warmly in favour of the step. When urged to call it without the Pope he refused (1532), and he hesitated long before he would adopt the proposed alternative of a German Council. Finally, however, the disordered state of Germany and the reluctance of the Pope to call a Council only too likely to lessen his power converted the Emperor to this plan, and at Worms (1545) Charles definitely promised a German Council if a General Council should not complete the work of reform. But there were nice calculations whether the state of politics would help or hinder the task of the Council, or whether it might not alter

**Demand
for a
Council.**

the Church too violently: whether the Lutherans could attend or be listened to, or whether their presence might not affect the Council too greatly. Many men held that the practical evils which existed called for reforms only to be gained from a Council. Others wished for a clear and general statement of doctrine. Neither of these demands, however, was due solely to the Reformation. The earlier existence of the former we have shown already: the Thomist theologians especially of Spain expressed the latter. The Middle Ages, in which popular theology had taken strange forms, in which speculation had been unrestrained and general, had left issues enough to be settled, even if the Reformation had not presented other issues more fundamental and important. The truth of theology, the existence of a Church implies that a close connection exists between theological truth and uprightness of life: only those who denied this connection could urge omission of either from the programme of the Council. Whether doctrine or discipline should take precedence was, however, a different question: truth affects the life: the surroundings of a man affect his soul; men equally honest could take different views of the relative urgency of the two tasks. Reform practical evils, and your very earnestness will make others listen to your beliefs and doctrines, said some: state your doctrines, and then the delicate lines between pious opinions and heresies can be drawn more firmly, said others. There will always be two classes of men—one thinking that a modification of opinions or a mild expression of truth will attract support, another thinking that the slightest possible sacrifice of truth in expression is a loss

outweighing the gain of many adherents. It is often difficult to reconcile the claims of conscience and charity. It was certain, too, that some doctrines of great importance would need restatement or large modification to attract their critics or opponents. The widening of the creeds or their reinterpretation, the surrender of ancient and accustomed rites were very different things from a strengthening of discipline or the dealing with altered conditions of life. It was easy to expect too much from a Council: it was easy to fear it would do too much. It was hard to see how a Council could do all that all men hoped for from it: it was hard to see how anything could be done without it. Larger and more varied issues had never been placed before the Church: the minority of dissentients from the outset had never been so large. The civil powers were likely to control the Church more than ever, and had stronger reasons for doing so: the politics of the Curia would certainly influence the Council, as they had long retarded its summoning. Controversy, schism, religious change, had all existed too long and been too violent to leave the minds and the reason of men sufficiently calm and spiritual for the issues that lay before the Council.

The Conclave that elected (1534) Paul III. (Farnese) had made him promise to call a Council. It was actually called to meet at Mantua (June, **Paul III.** 1536). His liberal education inclined this **and the** Pope to reform, although he feared to give **Council.** too much power to the Emperor, too many concessions to the Germans. But the *Consilium delectorum cardinalium et aliorum praelatorum de emendanda ecclesia* (1537) seemed to pledge the Pope to reforms.

A Commission of nine cardinals, including Contarini, Sadoleti, Caraffa, Pole, and other earnest reformers, had been appointed to report upon the needed changes. Their conclusions proceeded upon the principles that dispensations were given too freely, in wrongful cases, and for money; reservations, carelessness in appointments, pensions upon benefices, non-residence, bad monastic discipline, indulgences, simoniacal practices, pluralities, irreverence in worship, evil life on the part of cardinals, the too great freedom of academic discussion are all noted and condemned in this outspoken document. War between Charles V. and Francis postponed the Council, and another summons to Vicenza (May, 1538) had the same ending. But Contarini and Morone—both legates with experience of Germany, and members of the Commission—Sadoleti, and many Germans pressed for a Council. The Colloquy of Regensburg (April 5th, 1541) had shown both how far the Catholics and Protestants would go towards meeting each other, and how little could come of such a meeting. The Recess of the Diet looked forward to a General Council or a national assembly, and the Emperor was pledged to one of them. He persuaded the Pope to call it for November, 1542, and at Trent—an imperial city with an Italian population, and, as subject to its bishop, neither Papal nor German. The Papal legates, Morone and Pole, the Emperor's ambassadors, Granvelle and Mendoza, all appeared, but few bishops could come, as another French war was on foot, and the assembly was adjourned (June, 1543). The Peace of Crépy (September, 1544) made its re-assembling possible; Charles had again promised at Speier a free Council (1544). Cardinal Farnese had

been sent as legate to draw the Emperor closer to the Pope, and when this had been done, Pope Paul felt he could safely call the Council.

In May, 1545, the members began to arrive; on December 13th, the legates held the formal opening. These were Cardinal Del Monte (to be later on Julius III.), a Curialist by policy; Cardinal Cervini (Santa Croce, Marcellus II.), a reformer and a theologian anxious to combat heresy, a diplomatist who often smoothed storms raised by Del Monte's hasty anger; Cardinal Pole, a cultivated scholar of supposed liberal sympathies, forced by his almost royal birth and martyr-like exile into a position beyond his powers. The bishops present were mainly Italian, five Spanish and two French: Charles and his brother Ferdinand alone sent ambassadors. Proxies from absent bishops were refused: only the generals of Orders were given individual votes: three Benedictine abbots had a joint vote, theologians none at all: ambassadors could speak, but had no vote: the voting was to be in one body, and not as at Constanz by nations—a plan not now so much as suggested: the Italian majority which the Pope could always increase by despatching Italian bishops from Rome was thus decisive: there were three congregations or committees who held preliminary discussions upon questions prepared for them by the theologians and canonists: the general congregation or whole body then discussed the matter on report, and their decision embodied in a decree was afterwards announced at a public congregation. Some discussion took place on the proposal to add the words, "representing the universal Church," to the Council's title, "the Holy Synod

The
Council.
Session I.,
Dec. 13th,
1545.

of Trent duly gathered together in the Holy Spirit under the presidency of the three apostolic legates." These words, which would have recalled the claims of Councils to supremacy, were, however, rejected. It was thus clear from the outset that the Papal direction would be no mere form, and equally clear that it would have to reckon with the episcopal Order. The bishops were able to prevail in some small matters against the monks. "We are here," said one bishop, "to destroy or to change rather than augment their privileges": and the legates yielded gracefully.

The task of the Council had been defined as the propagation of the faith, the elevation of the Christian religion, the removal of heresies, the restoration of peace, the reformation of the clergy and Christian people, the overthrow of the enemies of the Christian name. The legates had been instructed by the Pope that doctrine should be first discussed; this would be convenient as defining the Council's position, but not convenient if the Protestants were to be conciliated. The difficulty arose from the politicians, who in their wish for unity handed over to theologians the task of compassing by definition and compromise. The Emperor, on the other hand, had instructed his party, led by Cardinal Madruzzo, Bishop of Trent, who was in his interest, to insist upon reform being first considered. By a convenient compromise it was resolved to satisfy both Pope and Emperor and discuss doctrine and reform at the same time in different congregations. But the preparation and manipulation of business, with their possession of the initiative, gave the legates a great advantage: they were always in close communication

with the Curia, and able to postpone difficulties until the Papal wish was known. The Spanish bishops urged to attend by Charles, and led by Cardinal Pacheco, Bishop of Jaën, were equally keen for reform and for doctrinal orthodoxy. "It was necessary," said Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo, "to strike at the same time against the erroneous doctrines of our adversaries and the bad morals of our friends." These preliminaries and their settlement filled three sessions.

In the next four sessions (April 8th, 1546–March 3rd, 1547), the Rule of Faith, with its sources—Scripture, its canon, interpretation and relation **Session IV.**, to tradition, original sin, justification, sacra- **April 8;** ments in general, confirmation, and holy **V., June 17.** baptism—were discussed. The Nicene Creed, as used in the Holy Roman Church, was stated to have its sources in Scripture, and in tradition (*a*) of Christ, and (*b*) of His apostles: the interpretations of Scripture held by Mother Church were to be maintained against private interpretations: it was significant of the variety of opinions that a few bishops urged Scripture alone as the rule of faith: it was a triumph for the opponents of the "poets" of an earlier decade when the Vulgate was affirmed as the authoritative version. Vernacular versions were, indeed, as the Spanish members urged, liable to abuse, not only in the appended notes, but in translation of terms: "Church" and "Congregation"; "priest" and "elder" are, indeed, not synonyms, and the sixteenth century felt the difficulty which our own age knows too well. But the Church should itself have undertaken the work instead of putting it off and leaving it to chance: a recommendation that the Vulgate should be printed

with correctness remained ineffective until 1590, and was even then not efficiently carried out (see Chap. IX.).

A thornier subject was reached with "Original Sin," closely related as it was to the doctrine of "Justification." Men of different types of mind will always differ in the stress they lay (Session V.) upon spiritual processes and outward forms respectively, and in the relation of cause and effect they assume between them. Luther had been by no means the first to discover either the importance of faith or its connection with justification. Both were to be found in Catholic and medieval teaching, but were there united with the facts of life and with the consistent practice of the Church's rule. Mystics and men of contemplative life laid comparative stress upon faith and the spiritual process, and it was this stream of doctrine that revived the Augustinian Friars under Staupitz: under such influence Luther grew up, and the medieval view, which he at one time taught, had not the defects which he afterwards charged it with. But he himself fell into error: in the first place, he underrated in comparison with faith the virtue of obedience and the obligation of a righteous life: his phrase was "justification by faith alone": from this cause came the admitted laxity of German morals in the period of his greatest influence: and for this reason he was warmly attacked not only by Catholics, but by Protestants, such as Schwenkfeld. That a man's justification depended upon his own feeling of its truth was a dangerous and unscriptural doctrine and deserved condemnation. On the other hand, the Nominalists towards

**Luther's
Errors
in his
Doctrine
of Justifi-
cation.**

the close of the Middle Ages laid increasing stress upon the merit in itself of obedience to the Church and of righteous conduct; they and their followers somewhat lost sight of the spiritual side of religion. The multiplied cults of saints, the prevalence of special devotions and of indulgences made this view of religion commoner. It was hard to keep the balance between these differing schools, for their difference arose from differing types of mind, and resulted in opposite errors. Aquinas pointed out the risk of analysis where elements were bound up together, and his followers attempted with success a balanced view; it does not follow therefore that everyone who laid stress upon the spiritual side should be called a Lutheran or even a semi-Lutheran. And in the second place, Luther departed from the view of justification as the beginning of a process (sanctification) actually wrought out in man's heart and life by the grace of God, and resulting in a righteous life; it became with him a purely forensic act by which Christ's righteousness is imputed to man, and man by his faith (which tended more and more to be regarded as an intellectual assent and not a complete surrender of the whole life and being), and by it alone was saved. There was thus involved in Luther's doctrine the consideration of man's free will and of God's sovereign power. The Protestant bodies could not afford as could the Catholics to leave these doctrines to the decision of practical life, and it was thus that the Calvinistic controversies were of supreme importance to the Protestant bodies while their issues were more calmly weighed by the Catholic Church. But it was inevitable that the Council as soon as it entered upon the

doctrine of Original Sin should place itself in sharp opposition to the novel and onesided teaching of Luther. For this reason the Emperor strongly urged that its consideration should be put off. In the end, however, this difficult point was discussed simultaneously with Session VI., the equally difficult point of episcopal residence. The decree on Justification itself Jan. 13, 1547.—which is an admirably balanced statement of the doctrine, and if issued much earlier might have altered the course of religious history—belongs to Session VI.

Pelagianism forced fresh issues upon the Church. S. Augustine, never disregarding righteous life, held faith a gift of grace, which infused into man, enabled him to produce works acceptable to God. S. Thomas Aquinas, developing this theory, regarded justification as an infusion of grace by which a man is made worthy of eternal life, and able to do works which have a merit in themselves. Justification is God's gracious view of sinful men, but a view taken by God must work itself out in deed and life. Luther, in whose favour was the technical use of the word to justify (to reckon, and not to make just), laid too much stress upon the imputation of righteousness: and the faith which, in his view, saved (for he confused justification and salvation) was the scholastic *fides informis*, not the *fides formata per caritatem*. His attacks upon the artificial theories of varying merits were just, but his misconception of the meaning of Justification and his disregard of its bearing upon life confused the issues. Calvin was, as usual, more consistent and logical: he emphasised the fact

History
of the
Doctrine of
Justification.

that without faith no one can possibly do works sufficient for or worthy of salvation. The Tridentine decree rightly pointed out the defects of Luther's teaching, and asserted in a moderate but somewhat modified form that of S. Thomas Aquinas.

The decree upon Original Sin asserted that Adam's fall had degraded him, and through him all his descendants, in body and soul: that through the Saviour and His grace given in Holy Baptism the effects of this fall are taken away: that the concupiscence left in man is not of itself sinful: these conclusions as to sin were not to be applied to the case of the Holy Virgin.

The
Tridentine
View.

Justification was defined as the translation from the state in which man is born as a son of the first Adam to the state of grace and adoption as the son of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ our Saviour: as not only the remission of sins, but sanctification and renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and the gifts of God. Faith was said to be the beginning of man's salvation, the basis and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God. Luther, on the other hand, regarded faith as the essence of all justification and as salvation in itself. The theory of imputed righteousness, begun by Luther and completed by Calvin, was condemned, as were also the classification of all works done before justification as sinful, and the assertion of the utter loss of man's free will.

In these definitions it was not only the exclusively Protestant view that had to be reckoned with: there were also the views of the German Augustinians, who really reasserted under new conditions of thought the

views of S. Augustine. Seripando, their general, accepted the distinction between "imputed" and "inherent" righteousness, the former of which could alone justify, and was needed to make the latter satisfactory in the eyes of God. This mediating view was rejected: although it had been accepted at Regensburg (1541), and might have some of the advantages of a compromise, it had too much of the weakness of scholasticism. Pole, who favoured it, withdrew from the Council on the plea of ill-health, but the importance of his presence or absence and the value of his opinions are often over-estimated.

Opposed to the Augustinians stood the Jesuit theologians, Lainez and Salmeron. Their learning, diligence, and facility of speech made them prominent and influential, and it was their view of justification which in the end prevailed. They were not pure Thomists as were the Spaniards. The doctrines of S. Augustine as elaborated by S. Thomas left, as they thought, too little room for human freedom and Church life. When the Tridentine Decree placed the beginning of justification in the prevenient grace freely given by God, it was on the Thomist side: when it went on to speak of the recipient of that grace disposing himself for justification by co-operating with grace, it was on the anti-Thomist and Jesuit side. It must not be forgotten that the Dominican theologians followed Aquinas, and that the Decree, while excluding the definitely Protestant view, sought to combine the Jesuit and Dominican views. It was impossible to throw over S. Augustine and S. Thomas, but the freedom of man and his power to possess merit

apart from grace could not be asserted without some departure from these views. But the com- **Later**
promise resulted in a later controversy **Contro-**
between the Jesuits and the Dominicans, **versies.**
which called for Papal interference.

In Louvain the tendency of theology became more and more Augustinian—that is to say, it laid more stress upon God's foreknowledge and man's lack of freedom, less stress upon the means of grace and the Church's economy. Michael Bajus, Professor **Michael**
of Greek there, published both before and **Bajus,**
after the last session of the Council of **1563 and**
Trent works which assailed Scholasticism, **on.**
and were strongly Augustinian. His application of Original Sin to the case of the Blessed Virgin brought upon him an attack by her special advocates, the Franciscans. In spite of the endeavours of Cardinal Granvelle to suppress the controversy, it went on. Hessels and Cornelius Jansen (a theologian of repute, afterwards Bishop of Ypres and founder of the Jansenists) had accompanied Bajus to Trent as representatives of the University, and were drawn into the controversy. Pius V. (1567), and afterwards Gregory XIII. (1579), condemned certain of the tenets of Bajus—all of them grouped around Augustinianism, the chief one being the incapability of human nature by itself for well-doing. The Jesuits of Louvain, in their eagerness to oppose Bajus, rushed into Pelagianism; as a result they were reprov'd by the University of Louvain (1587) and enjoined by Sixtus V. (1588) **Molina,**
to keep silence. But the Spanish Jesuit, **1588.**
Molina, published (1588) a work on the points under discussion, condemning S. Augustine's

doctrine, which, it was said, led logically to Protestantism. Molina, on the contrary, asserted that man may of himself co-operate in his own conversion and in the merit of good works. The Dominicans, especially Alvarez, attacked this position, maintaining that grace actuates the human will, and is irresistible. The controversy grew so warm that Clement VIII. appointed (1599) the Congregation "De Auxiliis" to decide it. This Congregation lingered on under the next Pope, Paul V., until its suspension (1607), awaiting a decision, never arrived at, by the Pope himself. But although a quieter tone was enjoined upon the disputants, the dispute went on, its ground being slightly altered by the well-known Jesuit, Suarez (†1617), on one side, and Jansen (†1638) in his *Augustinus*, published two years after his death, on the other. The former distinguished between "congruous grace," which is always efficacious, and "incongruous grace," which is not efficacious, because man does not answer to its guidance. Jansen, on the other side, combined the Augustinian doctrines (as approved by the Sorbonne) of irresistible grace and predestination with a Catholic conception of the Church and its work. His works were forbidden by Urban VIII. in the Bull "*In eminenti*" (1642) and condemned by Innocent X. (1653). But the controversy which Spanish influence could control in the Netherlands became in France of political as well as doctrinal moment, and lies beyond the limits of our period. The side issue between the Dominicans and Franciscans, however, upon the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin remained open even until the days of Benedict XIV (1740-58), who declared the

Franciscan doctrine favoured by the Church, although not yet affirmed an article of faith. The Dominican supporters of Aquinas had even upon this as yet minor point less weight than the Jesuit theologians whose influence increased immensely at Trent.

These controversies, which are not to be regarded as arising out of Protestantism, and which ran a mainly independent course, sprang directly out of the earlier and chiefly Spanish theological revival. They have been mentioned here as illustrating the formation of parties in the Council itself, and as being to a large extent a continuation of the theological issues that arose in it. Their continuance was made possible by the guarded and comprehensive nature of the Tridentine Decrees, which were meant to accommodate as far as possible opinions widely opposed, so long as these opinions were not Protestant. The smaller and endless discussions upon human merit were similarly the results of medieval teaching, and could be carried on within the limits of the Tridentine Decrees.

Relation of these controversies to medieval teaching and the Tridentine Decrees.

Discussions upon doctrine were less likely to go against Papal wishes than those upon reform. No scheme of reform affecting the Roman Court was to be discussed without Papal leave: in all matters of discipline Papal authority was reserved. The legates had soon come under the Pope's disapproval for allowing discussions to go too far, and he had thoughts of removing discipline from the Council's consideration. But the legates persuaded him to let the discussions proceed.

Reform and discipline : episcopal residence.

In these earlier sessions many questions of clerical manners and discipline had naturally been raised. In Session V., Don Francesco de Toledo, the imperial ambassador, had urged the priority of reform and over doctrine, and at a later date (June 27th, 1562) the Bavarian ambassador said the correction of doctrine was useless without a previous correction of clerical life, of which he drew a shameful picture. But quite apart from morals, the Church had not made full use of its powers for raising mankind. The provision made, for instance, by the Middle Ages for teaching both parochially and in a graduated series from school to university was ample, and far beyond what is often thought; but, partly by the apathy of parish priests and bishops, partly by the interference of monasteries with the ordinary ecclesiastical machinery, this provision was badly used, and this too at a time when the need for both spiritual and secular teaching was deeply felt. In the fifth session it was decreed that provision, either by funds freshly raised (and an appeal was made here to the generosity of princes) or by prebends devoted to the purpose, should be made in all considerable churches for catechisings or lectures upon theology and scriptures. In some cases this meant a new effort, in others merely an enforcement of a duty already enjoined. Cathedrals, churches, and monasteries were all covered by this decree, and the Ordinaries were to enforce it. Here, indeed, as in later decrees, the freedom of chapters and monasteries exempt from episcopal control was lessened. Some powers of this kind, it is true, were given to bishops rather as "delegates of the Apostolic See" than in their own rights, so that

the same process which increased episcopal power increased the papal power still more. But even an exempt monastery could not object to a visitation by a papal delegate where it certainly would have objected to one by a bishop.

The obligation laid upon bishops to preach was asserted so strongly as to recall the old condemnation of Bishop Pecock. All higher clerks and parish priests and all monks engaged in **Preaching.** parish work were also to attend carefully and under episcopal supervision to this needed work. But regulars were only to preach when licensed by their superiors and their bishops. The "questers," the begging deputations of the day, sometimes armed with Indulgences, were strictly forbidden to preach, but it was left doubtful whether this regulation applied to the begging friars or not. Heretical preachers the bishop was to proceed against, but this, it was significantly added, he was to do "by apostolic authority and as representing the Apostolic See." The discussion upon some of these points was more delicate than the bare decrees imply. Some bishops pointed in the style of Grosseteste at monastic exemptions as the cause of many evils. The monks and friars retorted that for many generations they had discharged the duty of preaching when it was neglected by the seculars. The legates feared that a speedy decision against the regulars might lead to a schism, and so referred the matter to the Pope. But the Congregation was not inclined to exalt unduly the power of bishops, and in the end the interests of Pope and regulars combined to keep up the exemptions with little change. It added incidentally to the discord between bishops and regulars

that the former were mainly canonists and the latter mainly theologians. The preparation of the decrees on dogma lay mostly with the theologians, who formed the majority of the congregation on Faith; the preparation of decrees on reformation similarly lay mostly with the bishops.

In the long interval (June–January) between Sessions V. and VI. the Smalkaldic war broke out in

**Imperial
politics.** Germany. The Pope, who was bound to give the Emperor help, openly praised the war as a religious crusade. The Emperor,

however, gave as reasons for it motives of State. But obviously it was now more than ever needful for Charles that a sincere reformation in manners and discipline (an object always near his heart) should be at least begun. It was as obviously undesirable that a consideration of those very points—justification by faith, and so forth—upon which Protestants differed from Catholics, should be undertaken. Some of the German Protestants were disposed to be neutral in the war: others it was possible Charles might win over. But either avoidance of reform or a strong insistence upon dogmatic differences made both of these results difficult to reach. Hence the turn of affairs greatly displeased the Emperor, and his relations with the Pope became strained. The interval of six months showed the difficulty of gaining what Charles needed as a step towards unity in Germany, and also the wide cleavage of opinion between Protestants and Catholicism in Germany and elsewhere. It was not surprising, then, that Charles urged the consideration of reformation before doctrine: it was natural the Papalists should feel or affect to feel

fear lest a war which caused marchings to the south of them and battles to the north should make a sojourn at Trent unsafe. Charles's promise to protect the Council needed not only intention, but also power to make it effective or reassuring.

While the Emperor was dreading a dissolution of the Council and the Pope wishing for delay, which, indeed, he recommended to the legates (now two in number, for Pole, on excuse of sickness, had been relieved from attendance in October, 1546), the thorny subject of residence came up. From the Spanish bishops especially came complaints of the avarice and ambition of the Church. Some others, however, saw and felt that if bishops were forced *jure divino* to reside in their sees, many at the Curia would find themselves in hardships; the centralisation of power at Rome would be checked, partly by the difficulty of rewarding supporters, partly by the lessened number of bishops there. In their reports to Rome the legates observed that the Fathers were now treating *de summa rerum*, and that there were some present who wished to humiliate the Apostolic See (October, 1546). Meanwhile the Italian bishops were quickly leaving Trent, and the legates urged that attendance of bishops who combined learning with respect for the Apostolic See should be commanded. The task of the presiding legates was in truth a hard one. It was equally hard to keep their turbulent flock together and to keep order when they were assembled: a scene of actual violence between the bishops of La Cava and Chiron (July 17th, 1546); angry altercations, in which Del Monte, Cardinal Madruzzo (Bishop of Trent), and Pacheco (Cardinal

Difficulties
of debate.

Bishop of Jaën) were the leaders—these things intensified the hardness of the task. Martelli (Bishop of Fiesole) and Nacchiante (Bishop of Chioggia) were specially outspoken, and therefore came specially under the anger of the legates. But there were difficulties which lay in the subjects themselves. On some of the questions discussed, as was pointed out, the Fathers, tradition, and even later doctors gave no guidance. The Cardinal of Jaën proposed to ask the opinions of the Universities of Louvain and Paris upon justification; and this suggestion caused fresh division. It was found difficult to combine the search for truth with the enumeration of errors. The Bishop of Sinigaglia therefore proposed to separate the doctrines approved and those anathematised into two lists; and this plan was adopted. After Session VI. the former appeared as decrees and the latter as canons; and this rough separation between opinions plainly orthodox and those plainly heterodox made discussion a little easier. The Cardinal of Jaën, supported by some twenty Spanish bishops, handed in their views in writing, owing, it was said, to the skilful manipulation of opinions (or even, it was alleged, of votes) by the legates. Just before Session V. the Bishop of Astorga, supported by the same cardinal, had tried to regain for the members of the Council the power of bringing forward subjects for discussion—a privilege which, after much heart-burning, was given them jointly with the presidents in 1563. It is no wonder that the legates used piteous language to describe their plight. The ordinary machinery of debate and order—not very much elaborated by the Middle Ages—was greatly strained. Undercurrents of

hostility, normally invisible (such as that between the Spanish Dominicans—strictly orthodox and keen against heresy—and the Cordeliers, accused by them of leanings towards Lutheranism) rose to the surface when the minds of men were much excited. But even now the skill of Santa Croce (Cervini) was able to do wonders. Both by his control of the Council and his diplomacy in private dealings with its members he saved the situation for the Papacy, and his calmness of temper and knowledge of men stood him in good stead. But their correspondence with Rome was a great anxiety to the legates. Even in the third session the separation between and simultaneous discussion of doctrine and reformation had aroused the Pope's anger. His demands for a reopening of the whole discussion were evaded with difficulty, and henceforth subjects affecting the Roman Curia were only to be discussed by papal leave. The legates—not for the last time—promised a protracted discussion of doctrine. The diplomacy of the old Conciliar days was repeating itself under other circumstances. But there were not wanting bishops who of their own will exalted the papal power much as Cajetan had done at the Lateran Council. Now, as later, it was asserted that while the episcopal order was of divine institution, the obligation to reside, the jurisdiction, and therefore the real power of episcopacy, lay *jure divino* with the Pope alone.

The decree on reformation issued at the sixth session left many details of residence to be dealt with later on. It was in five chapters. The first renewed all former canons against non-residence, and laid a penalty of one quarter's

Residence.
Session
VI.

income upon any metropolitan or bishop absent for more than six months at a time. The second imposed residence upon all clerks below the rank of a bishop; dispensations and indulgences as to residence were only to be given for fit cause (a bull of Pius IV. afterwards dealt with these matters more largely, and required the consent of the ordinary in all cases of non-residence). The third chapter ordered the punishment by the ordinaries of all excesses by seculars and also by regulars out of closure. The fourth entrusted the visitation of cathedral chapters and all churches to the bishops. The Council thus, and in other ways already noted, did away with many long-existing immunities and privileges of the chapters. The historic interest lost was more than counterbalanced by the greater efficiency gained and the control exercised over what had been the veriest homes of all abuses. The fifth chapter prohibited any pontifical rites or ordinations being performed by one bishop in the diocese of another—a regulation which checked the activity of titular bishops, and so far restrained the Curia in the too free use of them. On the whole, although the decrees thus issued were a promise of better things, the defenders of abuse might well hold their worst fears to have been unfounded. The subject of episcopal residence was, of course, left still unsettled; but as some compensation for the delay, the Pope, by a bull, ordered all cardinals holding more than one see to choose the one they preferred, and to keep that alone. This was only partly effective, and by means of pensions charged upon the sees given up the loss was tempered to the offended Curialists.

The subject of divine grace led naturally to that of the sacraments, another subject upon which it was not easy to conciliate the Protestants of any school. But a wide divergency of views soon appeared in the Council. It was not likely that the extreme Zwinglian views would find any support; but without that and within the limits of orthodox definition there was still room for difference. The old (and still ever new) discussion of the *opus operatum* and the *opus operantis* came up, embodying the objective and subjective views of sacraments, looking to the human and the divine sides respectively. The intention of the minister was also brought up for decision, and on some of these points debate was warm. In the end, the Council, following wise advice, proceeded by way of exclusion rather than definition, anathematising error rather than affirming truth. The thirteen canons condemned variations from the ordinary belief; asserted the number of sacraments to be seven, all instituted by Christ Himself, varying in dignity, necessary to salvation and not superfluous, not ordained merely to nourish faith, but capable of giving grace to all, *ex opere operato*, and not through faith alone. Baptism, Holy Orders, and Confirmation were said to confer an indelible character. They were not all to be administered by all Christians. In ministers celebrating sacraments an intention of doing what the Church does was required. Mortal sin in the minister did not invalidate the sacraments. The rites of the Church could not be omitted or changed. The fourteen canons on baptism affirmed the necessity for the use of real water and of our

Session
VII.,
March 3rd,
1547.
Sacra-
ments and
resi-
dence of
bishops.

Saviour's words. Heretical baptism, if in the name of the Three Persons, was held valid. Baptism was necessary to salvation. Some of the opinions condemned were those of the extreme Lutherans or of the Anabaptists, and the third canon is notable as affirming the Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all churches. Canon XIV. anathematised anyone asserting that adults refusing to ratify their sponsor's promise for them in childhood, should not be compelled into a Christian life by any other punishment than exclusion from the sacraments. This canon touched upon the medieval dispute between the Church and the State, which was expected to carry out the Church's sentence of excommunication, and therefore demanded in some cases a veto upon it. Some religious bodies have, in these later days, drifted into purely voluntary associations, with the very slightest powers of coercion, while the ecclesiastical courts, where existing, have been greatly restricted in power. But in the Middle Ages the Church exercised without hesitation its right of restraint and control. This canon ought not, therefore, to be held, as it has been by some, an *apologia* for persecution, even in an age when toleration was unknown. But it may be taken as a statement under changing conditions of the view held by the medieval Church. The limits of coercion were, however, really varying with varying conditions of life as widely as varies the theocratic tyranny of Geneva from a modern "Free Church" congregation. The three canons on confirmation affirmed that it was not an otiose ceremony—a species of catechism imposed at adolescence; that the attribution of virtue to the chrism was not derogatory to the Holy Ghost; that confirmation could be ad-

ministered by the bishop only. The outcome of these debates, which had been wisely restricted, was thus not so complete as might have been, and the most difficult subject, the Holy Eucharist, was left over.

The decree on reformation, with its fifteen chapters, had in its preamble the words, "always saving in all things the authority of the Apostolic See"—**Reforma-**
a condition essential for the Pope, who re-**tion.**
sented both the matter and the manner of **Residence.**
the debates, and had already determined upon a removal of the Council to Bologna. Nevertheless, the restriction was irritating to some of the members, who openly expressed their view. It had been decided to begin the reform by removing impediments to residence, but in many ways existing canons were either re-enacted or slightly strengthened. It was thus evident that the evils arose, less from defects inherent in the Church itself, than from the slackness of those who should have enforced existing rules.

Bishops were to be of legitimate birth, grave in manners, and skilled in letters. No one was to hold more than one see, and those who then did so were to resign all but one within six months or a year. Inferior benefices were to be held without pluralities by worthy and fit persons, not only resident, but actually doing their proper work. Neglect of residence by a newly made curate was to entail deprivation upon himself and loss of patronage to the patron. Where pluralities were allowed by dispensation, vicars were to be appointed. The ordinaries were to scrutinise rigorously unions of benefices and to visit those united. Those appointed to greater churches were not to postpone ordination beyond six months (the strict enforce-

ment of this would have removed one of the greatest evils in the Church). Sundry safeguards as to choice of fit persons and against abuses in appointments were laid down. Civil cases involving seculars or religious living out of closure, even those of exempt monasteries, were put under the cognisance of bishops. The ordinaries were to see that hospitals were faithfully administered.

Notes upon the Eucharist had already been circulated among the members, and heretical opinions concerning it were already under consideration when the translation to Bologna was actually made. The bull giving the legates faculties for the transference was dated February 27th, but the real decision had been reached much earlier. The Bishop of Capaccio died (March 6th) of a fever, and there was much general indisposition about. This illness was seized upon as an excuse—a mere excuse said the imperialists. But panics were easy to create. The removal fitted in almost too well with the papal policy, but the lessening number of those present was as marked as the difficulty of managing those present, and the removal was so far not unreasonable. Forty-two members voted for removal and fourteen against; but Bologna was to be only a temporary choice until another healthier place could be found.

To the Emperor, however, now on the eve of his victory at Mühlberg (April, 1547), and profiting by the divisions of the Protestants, this translation to Bologna, lessening his influence and making the conciliation of even moderate Protestants hopeless, was a severe blow. He urged the Pope, even with threats of a national schism, to reunite the Council at Trent,

where the Spanish bishops, carefully inactive from fear of any doubtful action, still remained. At Bologna only Italian bishops were present, and these, by the Pope's desire, postponed all business until September. For a time the death of Francis I. of France (March 31st, 1547) made that kingdom less inclined to help the Pope against the Emperor, but the new king, Henry II., soon became more papal, and a few French bishops appeared at Bologna. The Protestants of Germany consented at Augsburg (September, 1547) to appear at a Council if it were free and not presided over by legates, if they themselves were admitted under safe conduct and with a right to speak, and if the decrees already made were open for reconsideration. Charles was ready to guarantee their safety and freedom of speech, but the Pope proved difficult, and the murder of his son, as it was thought through the Governor of Milan (September), made him more hostile to Charles. In January, 1548, the Emperor's representatives, Vargas, Fiscal General of Castile (whose letters throw much light upon the Council), and Martin Velasquez, with the support of the Diet at Augsburg behind them, protested against the Council at Bologna as void. Now that the Council had disappointed his hopes, Charles thought himself free to settle religious differences without the Pope, and the Interim (see p. 116) was his substitute for a Conciliar settlement when the Pope was loath to sanction the seeming minimum of concession, communion in both kinds and the marriage of priests. But the lack of adequate French support and the growing power of the Emperor combined to force the Pope's hand; he consented to recognise

Suspension of the Council, Sept. 17th, 1549.

through his legates in Germany the provisions of the Interim, and after trying various expedients to bridge over the divisions of the Council, he formally suspended the sessions at Bologna. Once more the Pope had sacrificed the interests of the Church to his political needs. There was talk of a Commission of Reform at Rome, of decrees to be published there; but nothing came of it all. The death of Paul III., worn out by trouble and distress (November 10th, 1549), was followed by the election **Julius III.**, of Cardinal del Monte, who took the name **Feb. 7th,** of Julius III. The late Pope by his nepot-
1550. ism and inactivity had disappointed the wish for a true reformation. The cardinals who had that wish would have liked to see as pontiff the liberally disposed Cardinal Pole. He was also acceptable to the Emperor, and even with the influence of France against him only fell short of election by two votes. The Curialists would have chosen Cardinal Cervini, but to him the Emperor objected. To Del Monte he had less objection, and thus the election was assured. The Conclave had agreed before the election that the new Pope was to reassemble the Council.

Pope Julius was more selfish and far less able than Cervini; his reputation for a love of pleasure and a strain of weakness made him little likely to endanger his power and comfort by opposition to Charles. He knew, moreover, from his experience at Trent that reform was not only desirable, but inevitable. Accord-
The ingly a bull soon summoned the Council to
Council meet once more at Trent. The Emperor
recalled, promised that the papal power should not be
Nov. 14th, interfered with. The Pope, in return, con-
1550.

sented to let the Lutherans attend, and was even willing not to insist upon the previous decrees. There was some ground for the criticism that Julius was sacrificing everything to the preservation of his own power.

Sessions IX. (April 21st, 1547) and X. (June 2nd, 1547) had been merely for prorogations; the first session now was therefore XI. (May 1st, 1551). The presiding legate was Cardinal Crescenzio (of S. Marcello). Pighino, Arch-
 Sessions IX., X., & XI.

bishop of Siponto or Manfredonia, who had been one of the papal theologians at the first assembling of the Council, and Lippomani, Bishop of Verona, acted under him as nuncios. This expedient was meant to avoid disputes among the legates themselves, while the choice of prelates who were not cardinals was likely to lessen friction between the presidents and the episcopal order. Cardinal Crescenzio had previously, in a congregation of cardinals, advocated the reassembling of the Council, with the provision of such subjects and discussions as would leave no time for any attack on the papal power or the Curia. It would be easy to secure the attendance of Italians, and to play off the Great Powers against each other. This was the policy of the presiding cardinal, and it was, on the whole, carried out. The Bull of Resumption (this was the term used) claimed for the Pope the right of summoning and directing Councils, and after those present (only thirteen in number, excluding the presidents) had approved the resumption, the next session (XII.) was fixed for September 1st, 1551.

Although the growing friendship between Pope and Emperor had alone made possible this second meeting

of the Council, this was but a shifty foundation. Charles still wished for some changes in worship which might attract the Lutherans at least, and there seemed some chance of such a result. Melancthon in particular showed a wish for a reunion and a readiness to explain points of difference which brought him much disrepute among his comrades. But the Curia still wished the Council to mark definitely the errors of Protestantism. The outlooks of Germany and Rome were thus very different; and the latter was the more reasonable, for divisions of doctrine emphasised by differing political interests had really gone too far for reunion. The Emperor had prepared along with the Interim a scheme of reform in discipline which was of great interest, and served beyond Germany as a model in the Netherlands. Among other things, its provision for synods being held frequently would have quickened local life. But this scheme was wrecked by papal opposition based not only upon difference of opinions, but upon the general principle that the State should not take the leadership in Church questions. The Pope, on the other hand, although he appointed (1550) two commissions, one to consider appointments to benefices, and another the reform of the conclaves for electing Popes, was bent more upon doctrinal than practical matters. It was inevitable that, as the course of the Council showed the impossibility of conciliating the Protestants and the real cleavage of beliefs between them and the Catholics, Charles and the Pope should draw apart. But as usual, political interests forced the decision. France, under Henry II., had refused to recognise the Council, and was even threatening to withdraw the annates from the Pope. At

Session XII. the French ambassador Amyot, Abbot of Bellosane, read a protest from Henry, addressing the Council as "an assembly" (*conventus*), asserting it to be no true Council, but one called for merely private reasons, withholding for the present his obedience from it in the interests of Gallican liberties, and hinting at strong measures of defence. And at the outset the choice of legates—all either supposed Imperialists or known to the Emperor—showed a desire to conciliate the Empire rather than France. But in the war, Charles was not so successful against the French as against the Protestants, and his power in Italy, while more threatening to the Pope than that of Henry, proved not so efficient for protection. The little war (ostensibly for the control of Parma), in which Pope and Emperor were allies (1551), went against them. The Farnesi, striving to become a dynasty there, maintained themselves against them by the help of France. The Pope was therefore led to incline away from the Emperor to the most Christian king, and at length (April, 1552) made a truce with Henry. After this his need of Charles's help was less. When, in 1562, the Council met for the third time after ten years' suspension, French influence was stronger in it than ever before.

In preparation for the decree upon the Eucharist, some heretical propositions which it was easy to condemn, and which had been examined at Bologna, were considered. The theologians were charged to go by the testimony of Scripture, tradition, the canons, and patristic authority. But some Italians, less

Session
XII.,
Sept. 1st,
1551.
French
protest.

Session
XIII.,
Oct. 11th,
1551. The
Eucharist.

affected by the humanist movement than the Germans (for in Italy humanism and religion had drifted apart) objected to this. Theology—which to them meant scholasticism—was, they said, a matter of thought and discussion more than one of weighing authority, and they saw in the limitations as proposed restraints upon ingenuity and development of system. It seems strange that objections against authority in the professed interest of the intellect should come from advocates of a system often held destructive of originality. But we are apt to forget how much dialectic preserved valuable thoughts and helped reason as opposed to caprice.

There was one pressing matter, however, which threatened to become a cause of division—the administration of the chalice to the laity. The withholding of this was a medieval custom, arising from the fear of irreverence, and supported by the doctrine that Christ was fully present in either species (as declared by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215). But the Emperor, who was asking a safe-conduct for the Protestants and trying to secure their attendance, wished this special question to be deferred until they were present. The difficulties in the general subject of the Eucharist caused differences between the Dominican and Franciscan doctors; the Jesuits, along with the Spanish bishops, strongly opposed anything like concession to heretics; and this special question itself was a difficult one. It was possible to assert that the Church should not depart from the assumed actual methods of our Saviour's institution (although this was not urged at the Council). It was equally possible to assert that this was a matter within the direction of the Church. The

weight of primitive example was on one side: the possible results of a change in present practice on the other; for it seemed to many a dangerous thing to allow that the Church should admit change on any such important matter, even if the Council of Basel had allowed it for a reasonable cause. It was no longer a question of a dispensation for one solitary prince or one body like the Hussites. The demand for change was widely spread, and to yield to it seemed to weaken ecclesiastical authority. The proposal of the Emperor to adjourn the question was therefore readily adopted.

The errors condemned in the eleven canons were: the Zwinglian view, that Christ is only present in the Eucharist as in a sign or figure; the denial of the true, real, and substantial presence of the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Christ; the remaining of the substance of bread and wine after consecration, or the denial of Transubstantiation; the denial of the presence of the whole Christ under each species; the limitation of the presence to the actual use of the Eucharist, exclusive of its continuance afterwards as in reservation; the limitation of the fruit of the Eucharist to the remission of sins; the denial of worship (*latria*) to the sacrament, or of processions with the Host, or of its exhibition for adoration; the negation of reservation; the assertion of a merely spiritual eating; the neglect of yearly communion, at least at Easter; that the priest celebrating should not communicate himself; that faith is a sufficient preparation for reception; that sacramental confession where possible is not necessary in case of mortal sin.

**Canons
upon the
Holy
Eucharist.**

The doctrine positively laid down (although more

as an afterthought to the condemnation of errors, since the central doctrines were for the present left aside) in the eight decrees upon Eucharistic doctrine. was: the true, real, and substantial presence of the Saviour in the Holy Eucharist, His sacramental presence not being inconsistent with His heavenly session; the institution of the Eucharist for a veneration of His memory and to show forth His death; for the spiritual food of souls; for an antidote to free us from daily faults and preserve us from mortal sins; that, like other sacraments, the Eucharist was a symbol of a sacred thing and a visible form of an invisible grace, but unlike them it had a sanctity independent of use as resulting from Christ's Presence; that the Body was present under the species of bread and the Blood under the species of wine, by the force of Christ's words, but that by concomitancy of the parts of Christ the Blood was also under the species of bread and the Body under the species of wine, and the Soul under both, and the Divinity was also there by its hypostatical union with the Body and Soul: hence the whole Christ is present under either species and in any part of it. Along with Transubstantiation, it was affirmed that the worship of *latria* due to God may be rendered to the Sacrament, and that the bearing of the Sacrament in procession is a pious and religious custom; that it may be reserved in the sacrarium, as by ancient usage, and also carried to the sick; that no one conscious of mortal sin should receive without previous sacramental confession; that there are three ways of reception—sacramentally only in the case of sinners, spiritually only in the case of those who eat by faith, both sacramentally and spiritually in the

case of those who approach with proper preparation. The preamble to these eight chapters of the Decree assigned the plucking up of the tares of heresy concerning the Eucharist as one chief reason for holding the Council. By a strange coincidence, the ambassador from Protestant Brandenburg arrived about the time this Decree was issued. At the end of the Decree it was stated that not only the consideration of communion in one or in both kinds and the communion of infants, but also that of the sacrifice of the Mass was postponed in order to hear the Protestant view. There was some difference of opinion on minor points. Some thought that to deny the need of Easter communion, an ecclesiastical but not a divine obligation, was schismatical rather than heretical; but it was agreed that as the Church had authority to impose the obligation, its denial was heresy. Some did not think the denial of confession as necessary before communion was absolutely heretical, although very erroneous. And there was some discussion as to what exactly constituted consecration—whether our Saviour had used some form of consecration other than the words of institution—a point which touched upon minor differences between East and West. But detailed as the discussions were, the central conceptions of the Mass still remained for statement.

It had been decided to begin by removing causes that hindered the residence of bishops and weakened their power; frequent evocations of causes to superior courts, and specially to Rome, unduly limited the power of bishops, while the large number of exemptions narrowed their field of activity. It was laid down as a general

**Reform.
Episcopal
jurisdiction.**

principle that on the part of superiors charity was often forgotten in the wish for dominancy, while on the part of inferiors voluntary obedience was overlaid by murmuring. But to apply these excellent statements was hard. Appeals against interlocutory sentences or in earlier stages of trial, whether criminal or visitorial, were no longer to impede episcopal courts. Appeals in criminal cases were to be made from the bishops to the Metropolitan, or in his absence to the nearest bishop or their vicars, never to inferior judges named by the Pope. The course of appeals was regulated; the process of degradation was simplified as a bishop need not have other bishops present as required by the canons, the substitution of mitred abbots or suitable persons skilled in law being allowed. Bishops were allowed to take cognisance, as delegates of the Apostolic See, of the obtaining by false pretences of grace to delay legal proceedings. Bishops were not allowed to be cited in person unless for a cause involving their deposition: a bishop punishable by deposition was to be tried in person before the Pope.

Although these reforms were mainly made to safeguard the due power of bishops, and so indirectly to limit that of the Pope, their effect was likely to be considerable. For the pleadings of exemptions and delays interposed in ecclesiastical suits were great evils, and the papal interference with lower and local courts was so excessive as to paralyse ecclesiastical justice. For this the Pope himself was not, of course, to be blamed; it was rather his officials largely dependent upon fees who kept up the system. And the difficulty of enforcing degradation was so great as to encourage the worst class of offenders, an abuse against which

the German bishops pleaded specially. Each of these chapters, therefore, was aimed at the removal of real evils. Gropper, a leading canonist and theologian, who had been employed at the Colloquy of Regensburg (1541) and been a leader against Protestantism at Köln, put in an earnest plea not only for the removal of abuses, but also for the revival of synodal jurisdiction as opposed to jurisdiction exercised by officials. Such a revival would have not only decentralised Church administration, but made it democratic. He was replied to by Castel from Bologna, who contended that the Church as it grew from infancy onwards had outgrown its system of government, and that therefore too much stress was not to be laid upon an appeal to primitive times when synodal government and other things now in comparative disuse had been common. But the bishops would not hear of any revival of synods in this enlarged sense. As it was, however, the new decrees were all serviceable if efficiently enforced. The difficulty with them lay, as with previous regulations, precisely in the enforcement, hindered as that often was by officials, sharp men of business, whose sphere was ecclesiastical, but who entirely lacked spirituality.

Without any delay the heretical opinions upon Penance and Extreme Unction were delivered to the Fathers, in twelve heads upon the former and four upon the latter. Many minor differences were found here, as upon the Eucharist, but they resulted more from varieties of expression than mental distinctions. The order of speaking by classes and in groups, emphasised these differences by placing together those who

Session
XIV.,
Nov. 25th,
1551.

usually thought alike. But in drafting the positive doctrines care had to be taken to avoid expressions likely to irritate or even condemn any of these various schools. Thus in discussing Penance it was necessary to avoid condemning the opinion of Duns Scotus, that the essence of the sacrament lay in the absolution alone, contrition and confession being merely conditions needed for its efficacy. But the lengthy debates upon doctrine due to these differences made any full scheme of reform impossible, especially since Cardinal Crescenzo had named July, 1552, as the date by which the Council must end, and a full scheme of doctrine be prepared.

While these matters were under discussion, the ambassadors from Württemberg had arrived; their conduct was cautious, and, against the advice of the Imperial ambassador, they refrained from the usual call of courtesy upon the presidents. A safe-conduct had already been decreed for them at the thirteenth session in terms which seemed ample. But they asked for terms identical with those granted at Basel, as those in their view gave them a share in deliberations, and limited discussion by placing the Scriptures as decisive authorities. At the close of Session XV. an enlargement of the former safe-conduct was therefore decreed, which gave more satisfaction. By that time Saxony and some imperial cities were represented; in particular, Strassburg was represented by the historian Sleidan, who from the outset had no hopes of any good result from the negotiations. The day (January 24th, 1552) before Session XV. these ambassadors were received at a general Congregation; but although they

Safe-conduct for the Protestants.

Politics and Protestants.

were listened to with courtesy, their position was untenable and their demands extreme. They came almost to treat with the Council on equal terms, while in reality they differed among themselves (Württemberg and Saxony presented slightly different professions of faith, both of which Strassburg, a mediator as usual, signed), and had no historic position to warrant their claims. When, for instance, they demanded that the Pope should exercise no authority over the Council, and that the bishops for their better freedom should be released from their oath to him—they asked what was obviously impossible to grant. The same held good of their proposed reconsideration of former decrees. Moreover, the Emperor, although he had come to Innsbruck (November, 1551), could exert little influence upon the Pope. Hence his request that all doctrinal discussions should be postponed until the arrival of the Protestant theologians, although favoured by the Council, was rejected by the Pope. But there was more delay; Crescenzo (Nov.) tried to hurry, and yet hinder, discussions by suggesting that the bishops should simply accept or reject what the theologians had formulated. But the Fathers rejected this suggestion, which would have given the papal theologians, the Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron, the real control of the assembly. All these causes of difference, quickened by the pressure of politics, made the autumn and winter (1551-2) more barren of results than they otherwise would have been. In November, too, the Pope named six cardinals, none of whom were favoured by the Emperor. This disappointed the ecclesiastical electors, who, because of the outbreak of the war with France (March, 1552), left the Council, fearing an

attack on their territory. The Protestant princes had now leagued themselves with France, and the loss of the three bishoprics (Metz, Toul, and Verdun) by Germany was due to this treacherous act. When Maurice of Saxony marched against the Emperor and caused his flight from Innsbruck, the continuance of the Council was plainly impossible, and it adjourned for two years. Politics and the play of interests had once more stopped reform.

Meanwhile important doctrines had been discussed. The sacrament of Penance, it was decreed, was instituted to apply, by the ministry of the Session
XIV. Apostles and their successors, the benefits
Penance of Christ's death to those who have fallen
and after baptism. It differs from baptism in
Extreme that the minister is a judge and in involv-
Unction. ing labour on our part to attain a newness
Nov. 25th, of life. For those who have sinned after
1551. baptism it is necessary to salvation. Its *form* consists in the words "*I absolve thee*," to which the Church adds certain prayers. The acts of the penitent, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, are its *matter*. The thing signified and the effect is reconciliation with God. Contrition involves a sorrow for and a hatred of the sin, with amendment; and although sometimes it is so perfected by charity as to obtain reconciliation, this reconciliation is due not to contrition, but to the desire for the sacrament included in it. Attrition (imperfect contrition) is a gift of God which disposes the sinner to seek reconciliation through penance. Hence penance does not confer grace without any good motion on the penitent's part. Detailed confession of mortal sins is necessary by divine law, so

that the priests may discriminate and observe equity in punishment; but confession of venial sins may be omitted. While secret or auricular confession has always been in use, public confession is not divinely commanded. Confession should be observed at least once a year, according to salutary custom at Lent. The absolution can only be given by priests, and even mortal sin does not deprive them of this power. But this absolution is of no weight if pronounced over one upon whom the priest has no jurisdiction, natural or delegated. Bishops and the Sovereign Pontiff can reserve certain cases for themselves. The guilt is never forgiven without the whole satisfaction being performed, and priests should enjoin suitable penance. We can make satisfaction to God not only by penance voluntary or enjoined, but also by patiently bearing affliction.

Extreme Unction belongs to the close of life; instituted by Christ (insinuated in S. Mark, but promulgated by S. James). In it the Holy Ghost forgives sins, and the sick sometimes obtains bodily health if it be desirable for his soul. It is to be ministered by priests. These nine chapters on Penance and three on Extreme Unction were guarded respectively by fifteen and four canons with anathemas, defining deviations from the positive doctrines. On Extreme Unction the identification of the sacrament with the expired gift of miracles of healing was condemned, and the identity of the Roman rite with that of S. James asserted. Otherwise there was nothing adding much to the decrees.

The fourteen chapters on reformation guarded holy orders against abuse by the ordination of any one interdicted by his own bishop from such ordination, or against hasty ordinations by

Reforma-
tion.

titular bishops. By delegation from the Apostolic See episcopal authority over secular clerks was greatly strengthened, even against exemptions. The abuse of obtaining from Rome special judges, called conservators, who were often used to impede justice, was restrained. Clerks in holy orders or beneficed, not wearing becoming dress, were made liable to suspension; or on repeated offences, deprivation. Wilful murderers were never to be ordained, and accidental murderers only after episcopal investigation. No ordinary was to exercise jurisdiction over clerks subject to another, and benefices in two dioceses were henceforth not to be united. For the future no right of patronage could be gained save by foundation or endowment. Presentation was to be made to, and institution by, the bishop of the place. Most of these regulations were in explanation or reinforcement of preceding decrees. They dealt with evils arising either from the excessive centralisation of or the disorders of jurisdiction: appeals on one hand and exemptions on the other had put the ordinary ecclesiastical legal system out of gear. In the sphere of Church law and judicature the same causes worked as in secular spheres—hasty applications of general principles, sometimes new and sometimes old; the difficulty of combining into a coherent body a number of decrees and decisions. Moreover, the Church was not now feeling its own unity so deeply as were the nations separately, and hence ecclesiastical affairs were in greater confusion than were secular. Mercenary men and bad men used various artifices for their own evil ends, and so intensified the evils.

For the next, the fifteenth, session the Sacrifice of

the Mass and Holy Orders were to be deliberated upon along with Reformation. But from what has been said already it will be seen that the end was drawing near, and discussion difficult. The Pope and legate differed absolutely from the Spanish bishops on the subjects of papal and episcopal power. Germans and Italians were leaving the Council. The imperial ambassadors criticised the slowness and pettiness of the reformation undertaken. The presence of Protestant envoys and theologians could do little towards the almost impossible task of reunion. Session XV. only met for a prorogation until S. Joseph's Day (March 19) and for enlargement of the safe-conduct for Protestants. The reason assigned for prorogation was the tardy coming of the Protestants, but there were real reasons in favour of the closing of a Council for which no one but Charles really cared, which no nation would altogether obey, and from which even Charles could no longer hope for satisfaction of his desires—restored unity in Germany and a thoroughgoing reform.

Session
XV.,
Jan. 25th,
1552.

The Saxons withdrew (March 13th), then the ambassadors from Württemberg and Strassburg, after many complaints (April): and the southward march of Maurice of Saxony hardly made up for their departure. Pope Julius bade the legates to suspend the Council and send some bishops to Rome to help him there in the work of reform. But the presidents, Crescenzo being now fatally sick, preferred to leave the Fathers free, and the Council accordingly resolved "to be silent until better times," since "all places, and Germany above all, were ablaze with arms," and to suspend sessions for two years, after which, if the

causes for suspension were removed, the Council should meet again without fresh Convocation. This seemed to them better than "wasting their time in idleness." And, indeed, with the Elector Maurice at Innsbruck and the Emperor in flight, a continuance in Trent was unsafe; even the citizens themselves were fleeing. The Council had been mainly German in composition. It was for the needs of Germany even more than for general reformation that it had met. With the downfall of the Emperor's power and the success of the German Protestants, it became impossible to reach its ends. The political aims of the Pope had changed, and thus once again politics, and above all the politics of the Curia and of Germany, had spoilt the promise of a year before. Something the Council had done; but like its predecessor of the Lateran, it had done only enough to show how much remained undone.

Session
XVI.,
April 28th,
1552.
Suspend-
ion for
two years.

CHAPTER VIII

THE THIRD ASSEMBLY AT TRENT

WHEN the assigned interval of two years was over, everything was against a reassembling of the Council. In 1552, the war into which Spain and France had drifted in the backwaters of Europe reached to the main stream, and it was not until April, 1559, that the Treaty of Cateau Cambrésis brought back peace. The position of Charles V. had been gradually changing; as he saw more and more the difficulty of reuniting Germany, and realised more and more the strength of the Spanish monarchy, his policy became increasingly Spanish, and he put the interests of his non-Spanish territories second to those of Spain. Meanwhile in the Empire Ferdinand, both by his own merits and the withdrawal of Charles, became a more important figure. He had been elected King of the Romans (January, 1531), but at a later date Charles wished his son Philip chosen King of the Romans when Ferdinand became Emperor, or even to have become Emperor. In the end it was agreed (1551) by the family that Philip should succeed Ferdinand and the latter's son Maximilian should come next. But the electors would not agree to this, for they had more to fear from the Spanish prince than from his uncle.

Ferdinand's policy in the Empire was very different from his strongly Catholic policy in his own dominions; in the Empire he was tolerant, and accepted the inevitable with a better grace than Charles had ever been able to put on; he was, moreover, strongly influenced by his son Maximilian, whose sympathies were distinctly Lutheran. Charles resigned the Netherlands to Philip **Abdication** (October, 1555); he also gave him Spain **of Charles**, (February, 1556), and (August 27th, 1556) **1555-6.** he formally renounced the Empire to Ferdinand. The new Emperor's claims were at once admitted by the electors, and in spite of his non-recognition by the Pope he became at length fully Emperor (February 24th, 1558).

Pope Julius III. died March 24th, 1555, after a six-year pontificate of disappointed politics (for Ottavio **Marcellus** Farnese kept Parma) and of family enrichment (his nephew Ascanio della Cornia **II.** founded a rich papal family in Umbria). His (Cervini), successor was Cardinal Cervini (**Marcellus April 9th,** **1555.** **II.**), the former President at Trent, whose ability and moderation, together with his genuine goodness, led to great expectations, disappointed by his early death (April 30th). A month later (May 23rd, 1555) Cardinal Caraffa, at the age of **Paul IV.** seventy-nine, and with a past of stormy **(Caraffa),** energy, was elected as his successor. Of **May 23rd,** his piety and strictness (towards himself **1555.** and others) there could be no doubt, but years had hardened his character, deepened his impulses, and strengthened his self-will. His early wishes for reformation had now become a hatred of anything suspicious in doctrine or novel in practice; his

activity had thrown itself into the organisation of the Holy Office (or Inquisition) for Italy. In Italy the bishops resided at their sees less than was the case elsewhere, and the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction for correction of heresy or depravity was weak and fitful in itself, apart from the number of exemptions confronting it; the Dominicans also had lost much of their former zeal in this direction. Caraffa had acquired during his nunciature in Spain a double portion of the Spanish spirit, and he had both seen the Inquisition at work there and acted himself as Inquisitor in Venice. When Paul III. recalled him to Rome (1536), he urged the formation of an Inquisition under papal control for all Italy, and (1542) his wish was gratified: six cardinals under his own presidency were appointed for the task. Episcopal jurisdiction in Italy was soon overshadowed, and they acted as a Court of Appeal not only for Italy, but for other countries also. They succeeded in suppressing the movement of thought, partly evangelical and partly revolutionary, which had appeared in Italy—the left wing as it were of that other liberal movement in which Cardinal Pole and others had shared—standing in marked contrast to the paganism of the Italian Renaissance but having affinities with Socinianism. Caraffa had as little tenderness for followers of this school of thought as for unworthy priests, and his stern measures of repression were successful in crushing out not only this form of thought, but other tendencies from which the Church might have gained. It was plain from the past that the papacy of Paul IV. would be marked by earnestness of purpose and by a lack of desire to conciliate those opposed to him. “We promise and swear to try and

bring about a reform of the Universal Church and the Papacy," were the words of his first bull. A congregation of three divisions was appointed for reform, and their programme submitted to the Universities. A Council for Reform would certainly have his sympathy, but never one intended to conciliate Protestants or negotiate with error.

The Pope's political tendencies pushed him in the same direction. He was a Neapolitan, of a family hostile to the Habsburgs. He had suffered official injuries from Charles V., and chafed at his indulgence of Protestants. It was he who refused later to recognise Ferdinand as Emperor; and now when the papal power was given him, he felt bound to use all his influence against its enemies, who in injuring it would injure the Church itself. Hence it came about that a Pope intensely earnest in religion plunged himself into schemes which, except to his own judgment, had nothing to do with religion at all, and were founded on personal caprice. Under him Protestantism gained ground even in countries still in touch with the Papacy. In Germany Ferdinand drew closer to the Protestants, and division of religion became an accepted political fact. In the Netherlands the plans of Philip II. for strengthening the Inquisition and increasing the number of bishoprics (1557), following a policy begun by Charles, were approved by the Pope and led to revolt. In Poland the Pope's unsympathetic treatment of the Crown's request for some religious concessions and a needed revivification of the National Church missed a great opportunity. In England, under Mary, he insisted upon the full restoration of all ecclesiastical

**Politics of
Paul IV.**

lands (a condition the landed gentry refused to grant), and tried to re-establish Peter's Pence, while his hostility to Spain or his dislike of Pole coloured all his relations with the Queen. When Elizabeth came to the throne, a gentler touch might have kept hold of the somewhat slender cords of connection. Precisely when the nations were realising their individuality and intensifying their differences, the most religious Pope since Adrian VI. pressed his power beyond everything else, and in his intentness upon his own spiritual and personal ends would neither see nor hear the wishes of others. It was not likely that his plan of a Council to meet at Rome would win the approval of princes he disregarded or opposed. Only when Rome was threatened by a Spanish army under Alva, and his wars had turned out disastrously, would he make peace with Spain (September, 1557). Then, too, when he no longer needed the help of his nephews in war or diplomacy, he forswore the nepotism that had blemished his reputation, and he threw himself into the work of reformation with the impatient zeal of one soon to die. The year before his death left its mark on Rome in the removal of abuses and the change of tone, and it was as important for the paths of reform he indicated as for the things he actually wrought. Towards the end of his papacy (he died August 18th, 1559) Spain, France, Venice, and German Catholics expressed their conviction that a Council was needed, not to reconcile the Protestants (for that seemed hopeless), but to save the Church itself. The religious politics of France even alone made one desirable. The growth of Calvinism had been rapid, and the Crown alternated between a wish to overthrow and

attempts to conciliate the Huguenots. There was talk of a national council which might grant concessions, favoured by the French bishops, but disliked by the Papacy. Such a step would have fixed for ever the semi-independence of the Gallican Church, and the Papacy therefore had a special reason for watching with anxiety the internal affairs of France. In the conclave that followed the death of Paul IV. each cardinal promised, if elected, to call a Council and to undertake reforms. Even these reforms which the Council had decreed in its earlier sessions had proved a dead letter, and the theologians of Louvain had pointed out in an address to Philip II. the neglect shown for the Conciliar Decrees. A new assembly was needed to preserve the results of the old, not to speak of evils that must be overcome.

The Conclave, which lasted four months, was remarkable as the first in which Spain claimed the right **Pius IV.**, of excluding or vetoing a candidate—a privilege already gained by the Empire and **Dec. 26th,** **1559.** France. Philip II. gave the cardinals to understand that no Caraffa or partisan of the late Pope would be acceptable to him. His ally, Duke Cosimo of Florence, contrived to secure the election of the Milanese Gianangelo de Medici, unconnected with the noble house of that name, but brother of a cruel mercenary leader once in the Imperial service. The new Pope himself was a jurist of popular manners, skilful and experienced in administration—a cardinal created by Paul III., but disliked by Paul IV. Yet marked contrast as he was to his predecessor in manners and tone, terrible as was the punishment he meted out to the Caraffa family (two of whom, the

cardinal and another, were put to death), there was no change of policy, and Rome itself remained "more like a well-ordered monastery," as had been said, than it had been before Pope Paul's reforms. Nepotism as a system of papal government, able to plead for itself the risk of depending upon strangers or possible rivals, had been ended by the swift revolution after Paul IV. had learnt the treachery of his nephews and dismissed them the Court. If Pius IV. leaned much upon Carlo Borromeo, the saintliness of the nephew, inclined to refuse all honours but those of toil, and the prudence of the uncle, averse from scandal, and too careful to cause it, stayed all complaints. Bishops were admonished to return from Rome to their sees; a higher ideal lessened the scandals of ecclesiastical life. The prudence and worldly wisdom which even more than any spiritual conviction led to this result also caused the Curia to adopt a more conciliatory policy towards the sovereigns of Europe. The Pope was personally inclined to call the Council demanded by the general voice. "We might," he said frankly, "amuse the world for years with difficulties"; but he had already spoken of concessions that must be made to secure unity. There was, moreover, no longer any fear of imperial power overshadowing the Papacy in Italy. Inclination and politics therefore worked together. It was decided (March, 1560) to call a Council. Those were invited who (as the Eastern Christians) had an independent history of their own, those who (as the English) had separated from the Papacy, and those who (as the Lutherans) had separated from the Church. Elizabeth advised the envoy who bore the invitation

**Invitation
to the
Council.
Nov.,
1560.**

not to cross the Channel. From Switzerland only the Catholic cantons cared to come. The invitation was for the most part either evaded or refused.

But difficulties in getting the Powers to agree upon practical points somewhat lessened the Pope's zeal for a Council. France and the Emperor not only objected to Trent as the seat of it, owing to its nearness to Italy, but also demanded a freedom of discussion larger than the Curia cared to allow. It was now the States that lagged behind the Church, and had not the near prospect of a French national council given the Papacy a new reason for hastening the summons, delay might once more have put off the meeting. An even more important question was raised, but left unsettled: should the Council start (as France and the Empire wished) as a new assembly, or should it be (as Philip II. demanded) a continuation of the former sessions? Papal diplomacy had its utmost to do in getting the Great Powers to agree to a Council with Trent as its seat, and could not deal at first with these difficulties. The meeting was fixed for April 6th, 1561. The legates appointed (February 14th, 1561) were Cardinal Gonzaga, Bishop of Mantua, and Cardinal du Puy, Archbishop of Bari; but the latter, in ill-health when chosen, died before reaching Trent. At a later date (March 10th) there were added Hosius, well known for his learning and activity; Seripando, once General of the Augustinians, a well-known and moderate theologian; and Simonetta, a canonist of repute. The choice was suitable, and likely to be successful. Gonzaga was an Imperialist, able and upright in character; Hosius in particular, from his wide experience in Germany and Poland, deserved his

post; and the whole combination, although differences arose among the colleagues, was peculiarly strong. It was not materially strengthened by the later addition of the Pope's nephew, the young Cardinal d'Altemps, whose alleged qualifications were his German birth and his possession of the See of Constanx.

On the appointed day (April 6th) few, either bishops or ambassadors, were present. A proposal to consider an index of prohibited books was discussed, and when it proved hard to get any subject agreeable to all it was suggested the Fathers should choose their own topic. Nothing

Session
XVII.,
Jan. 18th,
1562.

came, however, of either discussion, and the Council was postponed until January 18th, 1562. At that date one hundred and six bishops, four abbots, and four generals were present; this new period of the Council, it may be noted, was marked throughout by both a larger attendance and a higher level of discussion. The Jesuit theologians, among whom Lainez, now General of the Society, stood first, exercised great influence over the assembly, and once Lainez took up the whole of the sitting by his speech. Salmeron, another distinguished Jesuit, was among the papal theologians, but four of his five colleagues were Dominicans. The state of flux through which theological thoughts had passed was

The
Jesuits
at the
Council.

now over. The prevalent uncertainty had been illustrated by the changing careers of many humanists and doctors, such as Beatus Rhenanus, Pole, and Staphylus (who forsaking Protestantism, became an adviser of the Emperor Ferdinand's and his helper in the "Libel of Reformation"). A large body of popular opinions (such as those about indulgence) had for many years floated

around the kernel of authorised doctrine; from the ferment of reforming tendencies and new forms of critical studies, opinions of various kinds, some merely well-intentioned, some revolutionary, had emerged. But these opinions were of all shades of intensity, and were variously held in differing combinations, so that it was often hard to classify their holders as distinctly Catholic or distinctly Protestant. Gradually, however, views and opinions crystallised, and it became easier to classify a man as distinctly on one side or the other. But at the same time religious earnestness, a hatred of moral corruption and real liberality of thought were found as widely on one side as on the other (if indeed in the case of liberality it should not rather be said as rarely). Of this crystallisation of views and doctrinal sympathies the Jesuits were the best examples.

The Nominalism which was prevalent at the close of the Middle Ages had been essentially **Medieval** sceptical, and in its love of the intellectual **thought** had often lost sight of the spiritual; it had questioned dogmas and drawn distinctions; controversy, indulged in merely for the love of disputation, and the exercise it afforded, brought with it a worse revenge than did even controversy just redeemed from sin by the touch of earnestness. These speculations had ended by taking probability and existing facts as guides. As their philosophy became more refined the Nominalists came to accept the existing conditions of ecclesiastical life as better, owing to the mere fact of their existence, than anything likely to replace them. The Thomistic (Aquianist) philosophy, on the other hand, had started from the unique pre-eminence of divine grace and the

spiritual importance of a living faith. In its insistence upon the importance of Church life it realised much of the abiding power of Christ, and found a stronger motive for energy than was afforded by mere negations. Here lay the strength of the Spanish Catholic Reformers, and it was by this valuable element rather than by the royal support or by the machinery of the Inquisition that they brought about their reformation. But the Thomistic philosophy had a weakness of its own; it had been unable to complete its task of systematising the many discordant elements of mediæval thought: still less was it able to assimilate the newer thoughts and vigorous tendencies of the Renaissance. It combined with its essential Christian thought an extreme conservatism, and a too rigorous adherence to its original methods; hence it grew (especially in Spain) into a hatred of new and therefore possibly risky forms of thought. If it was pious, it also became narrow: if it was devout, it also lost touch of the life around it; it turned (as did the Spanish Church and Caraffa) to repression instead of persuasion; it would take men by force and make them Christians.

But if this school of thought was narrow and had to answer for much that was harsh and cruel in its methods, it was effective within its limited sphere, while its moral earnestness raised it far above the accommodating Nominalism or the easy humanism of the day. One of its characteristics has been noted already—its followers, with few exceptions, **Nominalists and Curialists.** such as Cajetan, were not Curialists of the type so common in Italy. To these Italian Curialists the whole of the organisation and machinery

centred in the Papacy was to be supported because it existed. They had not the deeply religious view of papal responsibility and papal power that sanctified the Hildebrandine movement: the divine origin of the Papacy might be spoken of to the multitude, but for themselves it remained merely a convenient system. Hence it could be supported by means and methods that were worldly, at any rate, if not worse. The contradictions of the Middle Ages—that immense variety of thought which we, from our distance, so often fail to see—had thus resulted in two leading types: the enthusiastic Aquinist, devout, and often learned, but narrow and bigoted; the Curialist, an ecclesiastic more than a theologian—diplomatic, a man of the world, skilful, but not always scrupulous. Nor should we forget how greatly the system of Canon Law and its study had tended to produce men of this stamp; so that the opposition in the Council between theologians and canonists was something more than a mere professional variance. And, on the other hand, in regard to the Papacy, the Spanish theologians fell back on the theory of episcopacy, so that at this time the divine right of the episcopal order rather than the divine right of councils was the theory that mostly opposed the papal sovereignty.

But the progress of the Jesuits had resulted in a third type—freer in their treatment of doctrine, not keeping too closely to traditional methods, but conservative in their results. No shadow of unorthodoxy rested upon them, while their learning and ability was equal to that of the strongest among their rivals. But they were as little ready to conciliate Protestants as were the

**Position
of the
Jesuits.**

Spaniards themselves. Dislike of the new teachers, who brought disunion and heresy behind them, forced the Jesuits back into still deeper devotion to Catholic doctrine and papal headship. This devotion was both religious and intelligent, while it seemed to give an apparent remedy for two distressing characteristics of the time, variety of doctrinal deviations and disregard of Church organisation. The Society had placed itself at the disposal of the Papacy, because this was their spirit to begin with, and the policy thus chosen was one that in the existing political circumstances could not fail to be successful. Their success intensified their devotion, and thus the interests of the Papacy became as dear to them as to the Italian Curialists. To them the Papacy was the only possible centre of unity, and not a mere convenience of practical politics. Their support of its claims was due to a passionate conviction of their truth, and not to a calculation of existing facts. Gradually, moreover, the Society came to see that learning, intelligent and free, was their best ally for their purpose. This had hardly been part of their original programme, but soon it became one of their characteristics.

A Council was needed, in the view of many (especially of the princes), to conciliate or overawe the Protestants. Hence had arisen the dislike expressed to the early treatment of Justification, and hence the repeated demands from France and Germany for Communion in both kinds. But a Council was needed, in the eyes of Catholic theologians, to define and, as it were, codify Catholic doctrine. This had to be done partly because of the mass of scholastic material and

The theological necessity of the Council.

of questions already discussed, partly because of the existence of Protestantism, with its outspoken criticism and negations; for Protestantism, whether of the Lutheran or Calvinistic model, was, in its negation of Catholic doctrines, and its assertion of individualism against the corporate authority of the Church, a clear and consistent system. The same could not be said of medieval Christianity until it had digested, selected, and rejected scholastic materials and speculations. Hence new definitions of doctrine were needed, but not, as it seemed, definitions which would compromise with Protestantism. It was natural, however, that the order followed in the discussions should be that of the Augsburg Confession, for it was on the points where discussion had most arisen that definition was most needed. In the previous discussions upon justification different views had existed in the Council, and the result had been a compromise between the views of Jesuit and Dominican theologians. In this third meeting of the Council the influence of the former was greater than it had been before, although the persistence of the Spaniards, led by Guarrero, Archbishop of Granada, and the course of events, prevented their triumph from being complete.

The conduct of business was, on the whole, better than before; and, in particular, all matters of precedence were carefully arranged. The order of debate was that of the Seven Sacraments. The decrees on faith and doctrine were prepared by the deputation of theologians, and then polished by a few of the Fathers. Those on Manners and Morals were discussed primarily by the legates, and this, of course, meant their constant communica-

**Order of
business.**

tion with the Pope. The assembly gradually grew into a knowledge of its machinery, and things went more easily. But a wish for reform was in the air. It was necessary, said the Cardinal of Mantua, to improve doctrine by the eradication of heresy, and to correct the depraved manners of the faithful. In the discussion preceding Session XVII. the Archbishop of Granada, supported by Vargas, the imperial ambassador, strongly objected to the words "on the proposal of the legates and Presidents" (*proponentibus legatis ac Presidentibus*), which seemed to deprive the Council of any initiative. He also urged that the Council should be declared a continuation of the former one—a matter which the papal bull seemed to leave in doubt. For the present, the latter difficulty was got over by the legates explaining this to be the real meaning of the bull, although an explicit statement of the case was impossible if the presence of Protestants was to be hoped for.

Session XVIII. was fixed for February 26th, 1562. The three subjects of the Index of prohibited books, the invitation to the Council of those who had written suspected books, and a safe-guard for the Protestants had been prepared for the session. The third might have been settled without much trouble; but when the Archbishop of Granada pointed out that the original form of the safe-conduct would interfere with the jurisdiction of the Inquisition in Spain, the enactment was deferred, and entrusted to a General Congregation with powers equal to those of a Session. In the end the form used under Julius III. was used again, but its provisions were enlarged so as to cover

Session
XVIII.,
Feb. 26th,
1562.

the case of countries which were not in communion with the Roman Church. The Emperor significantly urged that the Augsburg Confession should not at first be placed on the Index or condemned, lest it should hinder the Protestants from attending. The Archbishop of Granada also requested that the words "representing the Universal Church" should be added as in previous Councils to the title of the Council, but the request, supported by the Spanish bishops, was disregarded.

On the question of the Index different opinions were expressed. The Archbishop of Granada thought the task difficult, and likely to lead to the neglect of more important subjects; the Archbishop of Braga would have preferred to leave it to the Universities to settle. But the general opinion went with the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who held the work to be needful and likely to be best performed by a deputation of those present. The way had indeed been shown by other bodies. At Paris the Parliament (1542) drew up regulations for the press. In February, 1544, some books, among which Calvin's *Christianæ Religionis Institutio* was chief, were publicly burnt, and the Sorbonne issued an Index which was afterwards registered as a decree by the Parliament of Paris. This was not the only list of local force. Cardinal Caraffa (Paul IV.) when Grand Inquisitor of Italy had put forth (1543) a severe edict against printers and publishers of heretical books. Lists of forbidden books had been issued at various times since 1524 by other inquisitors or governments. The University of Louvain prepared (1546-50) for Charles V. a list of its own which

was truly "expurgatorial," since it essayed the difficult task of correcting isolated passages instead of merely indicating unsound books. So long before as 1479, Sixtus IV. had empowered the University of Köln (which in 1549 published an Index of its own) to punish all printers, publishers, and readers of heretical works; Alexander VI. (1501) enlarged this jurisdiction for them; Leo X. (1515) gave the same power for the Papal States to the Master of the Palace. The bull *In Cæna Domini* (1527) included in its excommunication all readers of heretical books, and (1559) Paul IV., using his past experience as Inquisitor, issued a comprehensive Index of Prohibited books for the whole of the Church. It named authors all of whose works were prohibited, and also single books condemned as heretical, impious, immoral, or merely unwholesome; publications from seventy-two presses were forbidden, and presses which had published any heretical book were interdicted. Among others, Erasmus, censured often before, had a fortune which varied curiously in succeeding lists, the treatment of him and his works illustrating the spirit in which the task of selection was approached. Paul IV. with special emphasis included all his works; the Council of Trent saw that a list so sweeping needed revision; under Pius IV. (1564) only a few of his works were mentioned; Sixtus V. (1590) once more condemned all his writings, but Clement VIII. (1596) returned to the milder judgment of Pius IV.

It should be noticed that there was at the time little objection expressed to the principle of such a list; its formation might even be held the duty of spiritual authorities, who were to guide those under

their care; of Universities which had the needed learning and habit of discrimination, or (better still) of both powers together. This was the principle on which the work proceeded. A restraint of the press was recognised as needful; the exercise of this restraint was naturally considered an episcopal function, a fact which the history of the censorship in England illustrates. The Universities, moreover, were naturally regarded as literary and theological advisers. When the Inquisition gained power it approached the work, however, more from the side of repressing heresy than of guiding thought; less leniency was shown, and in cases of doubt the tendency was to condemn a suspected book. But it should be noticed that objections brought against the Index apply in reality more to the spirit in which it was built up than to the principle itself.

It is convenient to deal here with the later history of the Index. In Session XXV. the matter was brought up on the report of the Congregation. The Council was then hurried, and a discussion likely to go into details would have been wearisome; the list prepared by the committee was therefore submitted to the Pope for publication after he had passed his judgment upon it. Ten rules, afterwards enlarged (1593) by Sixtus V. to twenty-two, were laid down for its use; these were moderate, although they left a heavy task in the intended expurgation of works only partly allowed. Versions of the Bible in vulgar tongues, "since more harm than good arose from their indiscriminate use as experience showed," were only allowed to those whom the ordinary held likely to benefit from their reading.

This Index was accepted in Portugal, the Spanish Netherlands, Bavaria, and much of Italy. Pius V. organised a special Congregation for the Index, which up to that time had been controlled by the Inquisition, and it was this body that prepared the Index of Sixtus V. (1590). Clement VIII. in publishing a new Index (1596) returned to the original ten Tridentine rules, and his Index—which was largely based upon the Spanish Index, and was in itself a triumph of the more zealous cardinals over the Pope—was double the size of the Tridentine list. It was not those who did most for the extension of the Church who approved of such drastic and yet ineffectual methods. Canisius, the learned and energetic Jesuit, pointed out that the true remedy against error lay in widely diffused learning, while force alone was useless. Where the Index was most effective intellectual life sank lowest; authority gained a victory at the expense of energy. Instead of guiding its world to higher planes, the authority of the Church forced it down to a level where it was well regulated, it is true, but lower and less rich than might have been. If the Catholic were to remain a schoolboy instead of a man, he could never do the work of a man, although he might escape some of a man's responsibilities and dangers.

The interval allowed between the sessions seemed to many Fathers too long, but Seripando was anxious for reform, and the imperial ambassadors were pressing for it. The delay was therefore utilised to draw up a scheme of reform. While Seripando had the chief part in doing this, the actual drafting was left to Simonetta, who was more skilled in canon law and procedure. Among

Session
XIX.,
May 14th,
1562.

his chief helpers was Paleotto, afterwards a cardinal and a leading authority for this part of the Council. Seripando wished to begin by attacking abuses at Rome, but the majority wished to deal first with questions of apparently wider scope. Accordingly Simonetta drew up twelve heads for discussion. The first raised the old question of episcopal residence. Others dealt with fees for Holy Orders, divisions and unions of benefices, and their visitation, and the questers. Under all these heads grave abuses existed, and there was a general desire to reform them. Those connected with benefices were evidences of a long lack of supervision and of a Church failing to meet the needs of a changing time. They may be compared with those found in England after the long inaction of the eighteenth century, and the technical nature of the reforms should not blind us to their real importance. The fundamental question of episcopal residence, however, was an essential one for the Curia, and it had aroused many storms before. Simonetta wished, therefore, to postpone it; but the imperial ambassadors represented that to do so would be trifling with their master. The discussion therefore went on. A division which might have been foreseen appeared among the legates: Seripando and Gonzaga would have left the decision to the Council; Simonetta, whose letters to Rome were hardly loyal to his colleagues, and whose advice was largely followed by the Curia, wished to leave it to the Pope. A mere declaration of the obligation of residence would have been of little use unless the exercise of papal privileges, which so much interfered with it, were also restrained. In the congregation on April 7th, which was carried on until the

18th, the discussion began ; and it seemed as if (in the words of Paleotto) an evil demon had infected the Council : calumnies and accusations of all sorts flew about. At length, when the debates had filled many days, the legates resolved to take the votes as to what should be done. To simplify the issue, a simple *placet* or *non-placet* was to answer the question, Should the debate go on ? Sixty-seven voted *placet*, thirty-eight *non-placet* ; thirty-four wished the Pope to be consulted before going further (April 20th).

The main lines of the discussion, notable more for its length and importance (alike in itself and in the side-issues involved) than for other features, were fairly obvious. The Council had grown rapidly in its knowledge of its own procedure and in the habits of legislative bodies. Procedure was better known, and a tradition of business had been formed, and was followed. But at the same time parties were becoming more defined, and not only the leaders of these parties, but also their rank and file, felt bound to deliver their opinions. Hence, in spite of the fact that the Council, as a rule, both knew its own mind and its own methods better than in earlier sittings, the debates became longer and more involved. It was certainly so in the present case. The heads of discussion were : the evils arising from non-residence, the need of residence, the obstacles to residence and the means for their removal, penalties for the breach and reward for the observance of residence, the machinery for enforcing the decree to be passed. Some urged that, in view of the evils arising from its breach, the law of residence should be declared of divine obligation, so as to bind the consciences of bishops more firmly. Such

a declaration would still leave the Papacy free to impose moderate restraints or allow moderate exceptions to the general law—in other words, to regulate its application. But it was objected to this that, as a matter of fact, the laws of God were broken as widely and as often as the laws of the Church, and that to declare episcopal residence of divine obligation merely in order to ensure its enforcement might lead to the inference that laws purely ecclesiastical as opposed to divine could be broken with impunity. Such an inference was nearly inevitable, and yet savoured of Protestantism. It was better in the eyes of some to throw the whole weight of the Church upon the removal of obstacles to residence and its encouragement by rewards. In Italy, where non-residence was common, evils were, it was said, less abundant than elsewhere; but it was evils of heresy rather than of immoral life that this argument pointed to. It was also truly said that often the demands of princes and the ambition of bishops caused non-residence, by employing bishops in secular business at courts. The existence of the abuses was generally admitted, but opinions—swayed, some by doctrine, some by self-interest—differed as to the way to deal with them.

Meanwhile, the arrival of ambassadors from Spain, Bavaria, the kingdom of Hungary, from Venice and Switzerland, and the expected arrival of De Lansac from France, enlivened and interrupted these discussions. France, under Charles IX. (or really Catharine de Medici), was, for the moment only, complaisant and willing to let the Council rank as a continuation of the former session. Owing to its religious wars, France was now replacing Germany as the centre of ecclesi-

astical politics, and it was also becoming more important for the King either to make terms with his rebellious subjects or else to get all possible help against them. He was anxious (as Charles V. had been in earlier days) that the general trend of papal policy should not place outside difficulties in the way of his power at home. De Lansac was unable to arrive before the date fixed for Session XIX. (May 14th), and therefore asked for its adjournment. Instead of this, however, the only Decree passed at the session was one indicating June 4th for the next session.

The relations between the legates and the Curia had by now become important. The Pope had already begun his reforms in the Curia—an indication not only of his own wishes, but of the **Conciliar diplomacy.** conviction that reform was needed there. The first department attacked was the Penitentiary, then the Apostolic Chamber, and the Chancery; the reforms, however, were only slight compared with the evils that existed (May 4th, 1562). The Curia was greatly disturbed at the turn affairs were taking at Trent. The Pope, facile, soon influenced, and now led by the permanent officials, was displeased, and at first wished the debate cut short. He spoke of sending three new legates, one of whom, the Cardinal of San Clemente, was senior in rank, and would therefore supersede the old. The Bishop of Ventimiglia was also sent as Nuncio to Trent, in order to keep the Pope more fully posted in the course of affairs. On the question of continuation the Pope wished the legates to secure a declaration in its favour. But more at leisure and in calmer moments, wisely advised, too, moreover, by Venice, he soon reconsidered these de-

cisions. He consulted the cardinals (May 9th), and finally left liberty to the Council at the discretion of the legates; he put off sending a new commission to supersede them, and declared he was willing to approve a decree on residence, provided it were not termed expressly of divine obligation. At the same time, difficulties caused by the ambassadors also pressed on the legates. The French ambassadors de Lansac, du Ferrier (the President of the Parliament of Paris), and de Pibrac arrived (May 18th); the orations they delivered (May 26th) were very free in their tone, and also urged that the present Council should be considered a new one. France had never recognised the second meeting of the Council, and did not wish to have its decision forced; in this the imperial ambassadors supported them, but the Spanish, with equal firmness, opposed such an admission. The Pope was, as a matter of fact, pledged to Philip on the point, as were the legates both verbally and in writing to Pescara, the Governor of Milan; but it was clear that to settle it one way or another would at that moment mean the dissolution of the Council. It was supposed that the cardinals at Rome, who pressed the Pope to act as Philip wished, did so with a real wish to force a dissolution. The legates were, however, equal to the crisis; they persuaded the Emperor to withdraw for the present a scheme of reform (the Libel of Reformation) he had presented, and they contrived to put off an express decision on the question of continuation. It was easy to convince the Spaniards that facts were on their side, and that the proceedings of the Council both should and did assume identity with the older meetings; the French and imperial ambassadors (the

former of whom were strongly suspected of heresy) had to rest content with not having their view expressly negatived. It was a real triumph of diplomacy, and the credit of it belongs partly to Delfino, the Nuncio in Germany. From this time onwards unusual importance attaches to the influence it was possible to exert upon the Emperor by representatives at his Court.

In the next session little was done beyond returning a reply, friendly and not contentious, to the French orations, and proroguing to the 16th June.

The legates had decided, in keeping with their pledge to Spain that doctrine should be taken up at the point where it had been left, to begin with the Holy Eucharist. The attention, the disorder, of the Fathers was thus concentrated upon a fresh point, and bitter divisions arose. The Spanish were against any concessions in administration or doctrine; the French and Germans pressed for them. The legates proposed for consideration the following questions: Was administration in both kinds necessary? Should any exception be made to administration in one kind only? Should the administration of the chalice be conceded to any kingdom, and if so upon what terms? Is less grace received through one kind only than through two? Should those under age be allowed to receive? The Archbishop of Granada held that the Council of Constanz had settled the whole matter, and that no compromise was possible. The prevalent opinion among the theologians in their preliminary debates was that Communion in two kinds was not a divine institution, and that the Church had full power to order or authorise as it held best. The

Session
XX.,
June 4th,
1562.

legates, seeing the difficulty of a settlement, would have put off this special division of Eucharistic doctrine as a matter of economy rather than of faith, and therefore to be treated along with reform. The Huss-
Reception ites and members of the Greek Church had
in two been allowed to receive in both kinds ; Paul
kinds. III. had authorised the concession in isolated cases in Germany much as Clement VII. had been ready to yield it in 1532 ; Pius IV. himself was not disinclined to grant it, and his nephew Cardinal Borromeo had advised his yielding. From Spain, where the grant was not demanded, and where orthodoxy was firm, came the strongest opposition. Canons were drafted in answer to the questions proposed, but on this one point it proved impossible to agree. Primitive custom was admittedly in favour of administration in both kinds, but the Church had, it was held, a right to change the methods of administration as it had done in the case of baptism ; we may remind ourselves that the preference of affusion to immersion was a practice irrespective of climate, and essentially a mark of original Roman obedience. It was also argued that priests as successors of the Apostles were alone included in the original administration of both kinds. Now it was important that when such questions arose there should be confidence between the Pope and his legate. Gonzaga had thoughts of resigning, and withdrew himself from the debates under plea of sickness, but the Archbishop of Lanciano, sent from the Council to Rome, and the Bishop of Ventimiglia at Trent, sent from Rome to the Council, smoothed matters over. When the legates were given a free hand, when the Curia was itself divided, the Pope almost alone being for

concession, it was possible to evade a settlement. Papal diplomacy at Vienna contented the Emperor (who had just consented not to present his Libel of Reformation to the Council, but—to forward it privately to the Pope and to confine his demands at Trent to general terms) with a written promise of a future settlement. Ferdinand was hardly decided enough in action to suit his policy; earlier training and theological preferences struggled in his mind against political necessities. The French were equally undecided, but for a different reason; they had hardly determined as yet what policy to adopt finally with the Huguenots, and so delay was not distasteful to them. The religious war had now broken out (March, 1562), and until its close (February, 1563) war, and not diplomacy, was to be attended to.

The Decree *De Communionem* laid down four chapters of doctrine: (1) Laymen and clerks not celebrating were not bound under divine law to receive in both kinds. Although Christ had instituted this sacrament in bread and wine, He had not by so doing made reception in both kinds compulsory; nor is reception in both kinds to be inferred from His discourse in S. John vi. (the existence of varying patristic interpretations of which was noted to please the Archbishop of Granada); in other passages, too, He spoke more particularly of eating; (2) the Church has power to alter what does not affect the substance of the sacrament, and to dispense with it for the purpose of utility, and of this nature is the already decreed reception in one kind only. 1 Corinthians iv. 1 was quoted to prove this authority, but a criticism by Salmeron, the learned Jesuit, and Turrianus, who afterwards became a Jesuit,

Session
XXI.,
June 16th,
1562.

led to a limitation of it as not obscurely seeming to mean this. Considerable difference indeed appeared in the interpretation of scripture, and this is only one instance out of many where the Jesuits departed from the traditional interpretation. The same theologians wished to state that the command, "Do this in remembrance of Me," applied only to the celebrants as successors of the Apostles, and not to Christians generally, but this, although approved by Hosius and Gonzaga, was struck out on the day of session; (3) the whole Christ and the true sacrament is received under one kind, and those so receiving are not defrauded of any grace (a large number of Fathers, however, thought that more grace was received under both kinds than under one); (4) children are not bound to receive, although antiquity is not to be blamed for sometimes observing this custom. There followed four Canons against holders of contrary view. A note was added to the Canons that the Council deferred the examination and definition of the two articles—whether the Church's reasons for communicating in one kind were so weighty as to permit of no exception, and further, if for reasons of honest and Christian charity the use of both kinds were permitted to any person or nation or realm, upon what conditions it should be done. This Decree and the Canons were the result of careful consideration and redrafting. The Decree on doctrine had been entrusted to Seripando, Hosius, Patavinus, General of the Augustinians, and three bishops; as the cases of Cyprus and Candia, where reception in both kinds was usual, and as the example of the French kings, who received so at their coronation, were brought up, great care had to be taken in the wording. These

cases could not be condemned, and yet the closing words of the second chapter really seemed to assert the sole rightfulness of the prevalent use against an innovation which could plead in its favour primitive usage. The Canons on heresies and the Decree on Reformation were entrusted to Simonetta, Patavinus, and two others. It might be noted that the Bishop of Brescia proposed to forbid altogether the communion of children.

The nine chapters on Reformation dealt with various abuses: (1) Bishops were to confer Holy Orders and the tonsure, and give letters testimonial and **Reforma-** dimissory without fee (a stronger assertion, **tion.** that to receive voluntary gifts for ordination was simony, had been struck out), and official fees which were to be paid only to unsalaried officials were regulated (a homely abuse was here struck at which has in some places passed unscathed through storms of reformation). (2) No one, however suitable, should be ordained as a secular in Major Orders unless with a sufficient benefice or with private means sufficient to satisfy the bishop (this decision, although widely disapproved, was held needful to prevent the scandal of a penniless priesthood dependent upon alms). (3) In those churches where there was a body of clergy sharing the dividends, a third part of the income was set apart for daily distribution; thus penalising priests neglecting the daily services. (4)–(8) Bishops were to make new parishes or unite old, as needed; incompetent rectors were to have vicars, and scandalous rectors be deprived; bishops were to visit strictly, and see to the restoration of churches requiring it. (9) The name and the use of “questers” were abolished; the bishops were to publish indulgences, and two of the

Chapter were to receive the alms concerned without reward; all were to understand that these proceeds of an indulgence were to be applied to pious uses. In spite of admitted abuses, some of the Fathers did not wish to abolish "questers," but gave way when they heard that in any case the Pope would use his power to do so.

Gradually matters settled and the heat cooled down. Public opinion at Rome grew easier, and political causes

Session XXII., tended to make the ambassadors less pressing. Simonetta and Gonzaga were reconciled, and the inherent difficulties of the
Sept. 17th,
1562.

position made many think that the settlement of peculiarly vexed questions (such as residence) were better left to the Pope. But the demand for administration in both kinds—even from such strongly Catholic States as Bavaria—was continued; and as this point, along with the Sacrifice of the Mass, was to come up in the next session, a long interval until September 17th was allotted. The deputation that prepared the doctrinal decrees was also to report upon abuses that had crept into the celebration of the Mass. Once more the French ambassador wrote home urging the need for the French theologians to appear. On hearing that forty were to arrive in September, he begged the legates (but without result) to postpone the session.

As so much variance had arisen and the faithful needed clear guidance, it was held better to define the doctrine of the Mass at length. It was
The Mass. elaborated in eight chapters, to which were added nine Canons and a Decree concerning the things to be observed and avoided in the celebration of Mass.

(1) Christ at the Last Supper gave power and command to the Apostles (whom He then made priests) and to their successors in the priesthood to offer His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine, thus leaving to the Church a visible sacrifice, by means of which the power (*virtus*) of the sacrifice completed upon the Cross (which is here represented) is applied to the remission of those sins which are committed daily. (2) Since in the Sacrifice of the Mass the self-same Christ is contained, and bloodlessly offered, as on the altar of the Cross, the sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and is therefore fitly offered, according to the tradition of the Apostles, for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and *other needs of the living* (these words were objected to by twenty-six bishops as likely to encourage superstition), and also of the dead in Christ not yet fully purged. (3) Although the Church is wont to celebrate Masses for the memory of saints, the sacrifice is made not to them, but to God alone. Their protection, however, and intercession may be sought. (4) The Canon of the Mass, instituted many years ago by the Church, is in agreement with the words of the Lord, the traditions of the Apostles, and the pious ordinances of the Holy Pontiffs. (5) The alternations of tone, the benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and other adjuncts of the Mass commend the majesty of the Mass itself, and in adaptation to the nature of man (which is only raised to thoughts of heavenly things by external means) lift up the minds of the faithful to celestial things. (6) Although it is to be wished that the faithful should be present at every Mass and communicate sacramentally, even those Masses in which the priest alone communicates are

not to be condemned as private, but approved as truly public, not only because in them the congregation communicate spiritually, but because they are celebrated by a public minister of the Church, not only for himself, but for all the faithful. It may be noted that great disapproval was expressed of "*Missæ Siccæ*," in which there was no consecration, but on account of ancient use they were left untouched. (7) Water is to be mixed with wine in the chalice because our Lord presumably did so: water and blood flowed from His side: and (Rev. xvii. 15) "the waters are peoples," the mingling (after S. Cyprian, *de Sacramento Calicis*, Ep. 63) thus signifying the union of Christ with His Church. (8) Mass was not to be said in the vulgar tongue, but priests were to expound frequently, and specially on Sundays and saints' days, what was read. The nine canons were ushered in by a prolegomenon (9) noting the abundance of errors and the unanimous voice of the Fathers in condemning them. These ran as follows: those were anathematised who denied the doctrines asserted in the decrees above; also those who said that the Roman rite, in which part of the Canon and the words of consecration are said in a lowered voice, is to be condemned, or that only the vulgar tongue should be used, or that the mixed chalice should not be used. An additional Decree dealt with evils arising from avarice, irreverence, or superstition. Fees for celebrating Masses were prohibited. Wandering or criminal priests were not to be engaged to say Masses. Music of unsuitable nature was forbidden (there were some who would have abolished music altogether). Priests were not to celebrate at irregular hours or with forbidden ceremonies. A fixed number

of certain Masses and of candles was to be done away with as tending to superstition (this somewhat vague clause seems to condemn the popular abuse of "the sacrifices of Masses"). Exhortation and teaching were to give the Mass its proper position.

These Decrees had been formed after much deliberation from July 20th onwards. In August the Pope asked the legates to yield to the Emperor's demand for the concession of the chalice. All the imperial ecclesiastics urged it. There were proposals of using the concession so as to strengthen the Catholic faith numerically, for the Archbishop of Prague, Anton Bruns, saw in it a chance of regaining the Utraquists. Gonzaga and Hosius favoured it, and gradually the idea gained ground that it might be made by a Decree generally, and each particular case left to the Pope for decision. This was the goal towards which the legates worked.

On July 1st the Fathers had begun giving opinions upon the doctrine of the Mass before a large audience, estimated at 2,000 people. The old difference between Jesuits and Dominicans appeared in Salmeron's assertion and Soto's denial that our Saviour gave Himself for us at the Last Supper. This point, and the expediency of preparing a full statement of Catholic doctrine, were the only causes of long discussion. Salmeron's great supporter was Lainez, about whose theology there was a modern ring, although much of it could have been found in medieval writers. His erudition was used with effect. He based his contention on the ground that we were saved, not by Christ's death alone, but by His life and death together—a series of acts to which His death formed the climax. This

view, he held, did not derogate from the Sacrifice of the Cross. The Spaniards objected that the derogation was real—that the Last Supper was only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, not propitiatory. As in the Decree upon Justification, the final decision was a compromise, embodied in the Decrees and Canons summarised above, which said that in the Last Supper Christ offered Himself to God under the species of bread and wine, but did not affirm anything further as to the nature of the offering or its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross. But the compromise inclined to the Jesuit view, and allowed variations in theology. The Archbishop of Granada, followed by some thirty other bishops, strongly and repeatedly opposed the Jesuit view that the priesthood was instituted by our Lord's command, "Do this," advocating the view that it was rather instituted at Pentecost. Upon no other points did much discussion arise, so that although the suggestion to give the Decrees the force of Canons was not acted upon, the unanimity of the Fathers gave them a very real force of their own.

The first of the eleven Decrees for Reformation was general. It ordered all clerks to bear themselves soberly and discreetly in manner and dress, avoiding all worldly business, keeping themselves far from dice and games. The second ordered bishops to be of legitimate birth, of character approved by superiors, and certified by testimonials or university standing as fit to teach. The third (much like Chapter III. of Session XXI.) dealt with the daily distribution in chapters, and ordered the share of members not fulfilling their daily duty to go to the fabric of the church or

**Reforma-
tion.
Eleven
Decrees.
The
clergy.**

to some other pious use. Other Chapters provided that only those should have a voice in chapters, cathedrals, or collegiate churches who were at least subdeacons. Anyone nominated to a post must within a year qualify himself by ordination as needed. In future only those of suitable age and honest life should be appointed. Dispensations for use outside the Curia must be shown to the ordinaries in order to be effective. Legates, nuncios, and metropolitans, in cases of appeal, were to follow the procedure as laid down by Innocent IV. and other Popes. Bishops, as delegates of the Apostolic See, were to take charge as executors of all pious gifts or legacies to colleges, schools, hospitals, etc., and should be visitors, except in those foundations under royal protection. Administrators, ecclesiastical or lay, of all churches, hospitals, guilds, etc., were to render yearly accounts to the ordinaries. Any offender who from cupidity should wrong pious foundations, should be excommunicated until he had made restitution and been absolved by the Pope. These reforms have been condemned as slight, but they deal with evils most apparent in the Church at large, and the number of questions upon them raised by commentators is possibly the best measure of their importance. They laid upon the bishops heavy but rightful burdens which their predecessors had often shirked, and it really mattered little in practice if their authority was noted as a delegation from the Papacy. Some of the provisions as to wills and visitations of foundations seemed likely to lead to conflict with secular powers, but this would arise not so much on the general principles, for such powers would be recognised as belonging to the Church, but in the details of administration and in special cases.

The important question of the concession of the chalice had now to be faced. A paper giving reasons in its favour had been drawn up by the Bishop of Fünfkirchen in Hungary, and presented to the legates for the benefit of the Council. To satisfy the Emperor and the French, the legates thought first of introducing two decrees, one declaring that for sufficient causes the chalice might, in the opinion of the Council and the Pope, be conceded, and the other that the authority to concede it should rest with the local bishops under certain conditions. The Pope, but not the Fathers as a body, approved this course. It would have been easy, as proposed, to limit the concession to the Emperor's dominions (his Italian fiefs were, however, expressly excluded by his ambassadors); those receiving it were to accept Catholic doctrine and worship, and to promise obedience to the Decrees of the Council; the clergy were to teach with the utmost care that communion in one kind was right; confession as usual was to precede communion; it was also suggested that the administration in two kinds might only take place on certain days; special care was to be taken against possible irreverence in the use of the chalice, and reservation of the wine was to be forbidden. The matter came before a general congregation (August 28th), and it was easily seen that the Fathers would never make the concession. Lainez, in particular, distinguished himself by a speech in which he urged the Fathers to disregard the Emperor, and to cast away the fear of princes. When the voting came on (September 6th), opinions were divided; fourteen voted to defer the matter (as the Archbishop of Granada had recommended), thirty-eight for refusing

the concession, twenty-nine for granting it, twenty-four for referring it to the Pope, nineteen would limit it to Bohemia and Hungary alone (thus excluding Germany), thirty-one would concede it if the Pope alone were to execute the Decree and determine its application, ten voted against it while leaving the decision to the Pope. The Bishop of Fünfkirchen now became anxious that the legates should get the matter left to the Pope. The legates drafted a request to the Pope to concede the chalice, "such a concession, upon condition of pleasing him, being wished for by the Council"; but (September 15th) this was opposed as seeming to limit the Pope's power of action without the Council, and was lost by seventy-nine to sixty-nine; therefore a milder form was adopted. After referring to the two questions proposed and deferred in Session XXI., "the whole matter was referred to our most Holy Lord, who, by his peculiar prudence, should do that which he should judge useful to the Christian Commonwealth and salutary to those seeking the chalice." This Decree was carried by ninety-eight to thirty-eight (September 16th), but only with difficulty, and by the intervention of Simonetta. This Decree was added after those on Reformation.

To the Emperor this proposed settlement was distasteful, for a papal concession would have less weight in Germany than one from a General Council. His ambassadors, along with those of France (still pleading for delay), urged the immediate consideration of reforms in discipline. The Imperialists presented the "Libel of Reformation"; the French, a somewhat similar scheme of reform; both of them documents meriting some description.

When Ferdinand, for the sake both of his hereditary lands and the Empire, began a policy of conciliation and tolerance, he instituted a commission of bishops and others to prepare for him (September, 1561) a scheme of Reformation. This commission proposed to lessen the power of the cardinals and their number, to divide them equally among the nations, and take away from them the election of the Pope. The authority of the Council—the reassembling of which was just then looked for—was to be supreme, and to limit greatly that of the Papacy. The ecclesiastical centre of gravity was to be moved from Italy, and the Princes were to undertake the task of reform, redistributing funds which seemed to the lay eye superfluous. The significance of the scheme lay not so much in the reforms proposed as in the assertion of national independence and a national share in the government of the Church; even more significant still was the right of the Prince to direct a reform—a principle which filtered from Wiclif into many streams of thought, and had caused antagonism between Charles V. and the Papacy.

This report, drawn up by the commission, was obviously too extreme for submission to the Council, and so the Emperor asked a few advisers (including Staphylus) to prepare another document for the Council. This followed the lines of the other, but went into detail. Beginning with the reform of the Curia, it would have had only twenty-six cardinals. Residence was to be enforced upon bishops; simony, exemptions, and dispensations were to be abolished; excommunications were to be limited; the Mass was to be put into

the vulgar tongue; the chalice to be administered to the laity; the Service-books were to be revised; the use of flesh during Lent and clerical marriage were to be allowed. It was this document that the Emperor sent (May 22nd, 1562) to his ambassadors at Trent. At first it was quietly dealt with, forwarded to the Pope, and a few points in it selected for consideration. It now reappeared as a definite programme (Sept.). The French "Libel of Reformation," presented at a later date (January 2nd, 1563), when the Huguenots had been for the time defeated, was in thirty-four articles. It asked that the characters and attainments of those to be ordered priests and bishops should be tested carefully; that the teaching work of the Church should be enlarged by a reform of monasteries and convents, the institution of frequent sermons, and the publication of a good catechism; that pluralities, pensions on benefices, and sinecures should be abolished; that dispensations for matrimony should be suppressed; the vulgar tongue introduced into the services of the Church; the chalice administered to the laity; excommunications limited; abuses of images, indulgences, pilgrimages, and relics restrained; diocesan councils should be held yearly, provincial every two, and general every ten years. This scheme dates back substantially to instructions given to the Cardinal of Lorraine (November, 1562), which are in outline the same. It will be noticed that the French and German schemes differ: the Germans dealt more with constitutional and national grievances; the French aimed at a higher standard of knowledge and thought. For practical purposes, however, they agreed; and as the German scheme acquired a renown little inferior to that

of the oft-reappearing *Centum Gravamina* of earlier years, and the French scheme was printed and widely circulated, their effect was great. Other States were known to sympathise with many of the demands, and a scheme of reform under some ninety heads had been presented previously for papal consideration by Italian bishops.

Immediately after Session XXII., when the question was brought urgently before them by the Imperialists and the French (the latter still awaiting their Cardinal of Lorraine and theologians, who would, it was rumoured, make a strong stand for the independence of the Council), the legates handed over the Libel to Simonetta and four others to extract definite proposals. But the Libel in all its nakedness they declared hostile to Christian piety and impossible to submit to the Council. A careful selection of points was made by leave of the Pope and Cardinal Carlo Borromeo.

Meanwhile the theologians were divided into six classes, three being set to prepare Decrees on Holy Orders. Orders and three on Matrimony. The Seven heretical propositions it was proposed to condemn were that (1) Holy Orders are not a sacrament, but (2) a human figment; (3) not one sacrament with lower orders as steps to the priesthood; (4) there is no hierarchy, but all Christians are priests, and a call from the people is necessary; a priest can again become a layman; (5) there is no priesthood in the New Testament, and the only ministerial office is that of preaching; (6) unction and the other ceremonies in Ordination are vain, and the Holy Ghost is not given in Ordination; (7) bishops

are not superior to priests, and can confirm and ordain no more than priests; those who have not had canonical ordination can be true ministers of the Word and Sacraments. In discussing these various heretical propositions the speeches of the theologians were limited (not for the first time) to half an hour, as prolixity had been growing of late.

Many vital questions arose out of these propositions. Holy Orders could not be discussed without episcopacy, and thus by a side wind the old point of residence came up again, as well as the relation of bishops to the Pope. The Spanish bishops wished to assert the divine origin of episcopacy, and asked the legates to introduce a Decree drafted by Cardinal Crescenzo at an earlier date asserting the episcopate to have been instituted by Christ, and to be, by divine law, superior to the priesthood. The legates were able to reply that they were merely discussing points raised by heretics, and not other speculations. The Confession of Augsburg, they argued, recognised the divine origin of episcopacy, but erred on the accessories. Passages brought from heretical works were, as Seripando (now acting as chief legate) thought, not aimed at episcopacy in itself, but against the rightfulness of existing bishops. In reply it was pointed out that Calvinism certainly denied the divine origin of episcopacy, and that the Council had to deal with all heretical views, not merely those of the Lutherans. In discussing episcopacy, Salmeron denied that election had ever belonged to the people, wherein his old opponent Soto contradicted him, while yet admitting, however, that this merely administrative point could be altered by the Pontiff; as to the part the voice of

the people played opinions differed in debate. But many agreed that the episcopate was a distinct order and should be recognised as such. Some admitted this distinction in order, but found no independent jurisdiction, as all jurisdiction was derived from the Papacy. Others contended that bishops derived both office and jurisdiction from God, but that the Pope regulated the scope and use of both. Much discussion followed. Lainez spoke for one whole day, placing all jurisdiction in the Pope, from whose grant bishops derived their jurisdiction. One hundred and eighty-one other Fathers spoke also on this fundamental doctrine. Here was raised the question of papal and episcopal power, upon which had hinged so much of the history and the development of the Middle Ages. The original draft of the Canons underwent much change, and it was seen how many points had been undecided by the scholastic teaching.

The legates were now begged to fulfil their promise of allowing the subject of residence to come up with that of Holy Orders. Philip of Spain was also influencing the Kings of France and Portugal to join with him in demanding the removal of the words "on the proposal of the legates" (*proponentibus legatis*) from the Acts. It was found that the initiative in the hands of the legates was too strict a limit upon discussion. The legates pressed the Pope to end the question of residence once for all, and Pius decided that heavy punishment should be assigned to non-resident bishops and curates, but that nothing should be said as to the divine obligation. A Decree to that effect was submitted in Congregation (November 6th). The former Decree against non-residence was extended; good

causes for non-residence were named; loss of revenue and incapacity for office were to follow persistent non-residence.

An attempt was also made to draft a new Canon on episcopacy in which all would agree; but the Spaniards, to whom it was shown privately, refused it. Bishops were declared to have been instituted by Christ, but the omission of any further statement was distasteful to them. They were willing to declare bishops subject to the Papacy by the law of God, and bound to obedience; but they insisted that the divine origin of episcopacy, derived from Christ Himself, should be fully stated. The Canon was therefore modified twice. One form said episcopal jurisdiction was conferred by Christ in His Vicar, the Roman Pontiff, which jurisdiction is derived by bishops from him when they are assumed into a part of his oversight. But again the Spaniards objected, and Seripando himself thought the wording ambiguous—a fault which the Pope specially wished to avoid. Further alterations again failed to commend the draft. As a matter of fact, it was difficult to find a form of words to gloss over a fundamental difference of view—a truth which Lutherans and Zwinglians had before this discovered for themselves. But the arrival of Charles of Guise, Archbishop of Rheims and Cardinal of Lorraine (as he was called), altered the conditions of the Council. The Congregation (November 9th) put off the session fixed for November 12th until his arrival. He reached Trent on November 13th, along with eighteen French bishops and theologians. He was a perfect type of the ecclesiastical statesman of the day; interested in everything,

**Arrival
of the
Cardinal
of
Lorraine.**

with a Frenchman's charm of manner and adaptability, something of real diplomatic ability, and something also of an ambition to make a great figure. He was soundly educated, and had the advantage of competent advisers. A combination of the knowledge of the Sorbonne and the legal traditions of the Parliament was just what was needed in the Council. The Cardinal had been expected with fear and with hope, both tinged with uncertainty. He had no past conciliar associations of party or cabals to hamper him, and he was absolutely without scruples, moral or religious. He was an accomplished player, and, backed by skill and ambition, he had now come to encounter the best players of his day in what was to him a game, not always to be had, with high stakes and much excitement. On his first appearance he described the state of France, torn by wars and bleeding from religious discord. A reformation such as the Council might make could alone restore to her unity and peace. He had some personal right to speak for the national Church, for his oration at Poissy had perhaps saved the situation. Since then his advocacy of the concession of the chalice and his broad sympathy had given him a unique position, well suited to an advocate of Gallican independence.

A stormy debate, in which the Bishop of Guadix (near Granada) argued the papal institution of bishops not to be essential, giving as an example the suffragans of Salzburg (confirmed by their Metropolitan and not by the Pope), was chiefly remarkable for the Cardinal's speech in defence of episcopacy. His general attitude, cautious and diplomatic, was that the matter of order was in itself difficult: he wished

therefore to introduce some mention of the imposition of hands which, strangely enough, had been purposely left out. He was not anxious expressly to define episcopacy as of divine origin, for to do so might now seem an attack on the Papacy just when it needed support. The new arrival seemed to increase the difficulties of the legates; it was impossible to carry out the command of the Pope, that his power must be assumed in any definition as fundamental and supreme. They talked of closing the Council, and he wished it done, but these questions had to be settled. It seemed no gain when the legates turned the Council away from the subject of Episcopal Order to the equally difficult one of Residence. The debates were so long that the session fixed for November 26th was further put off until December 17th, and again and again; once more in the course of the delay Congregations met twice a day instead of twice a week as at first.

The legates sought advice at Rome; Cardinal Borromeo sent three forms of Canon VII. (see p. 206) placed in the order preferred by the Pope. They might pass a Decree on Residence, which the Cardinals of Trent and Lorraine had been set to consider, but it must on no account be defined as of divine obligation. In the course of the debates an eighth Canon on the Primacy of Rome was also proposed, which enlarged the discussion. In this proposed new Canon the Pope was described as ruler of the Universal Church (*rector universalis ecclesiae*), and to the French bishops this seemed to imply an inferiority of the Council to the Pope; moreover, they denied their dependence for Order upon the Pope, and were doubtful if they depended upon him for jurisdiction. The Cardinal of

Lorraine in all these matters showed a dexterity as a draftsman which partly explains his power over assemblies; a version of Canon VII. proposed by him, for instance, met with the approval of the theologians except Lainez, although the Canonists and Simonetta disliked it. Further postponements of the session were necessary (Feb. 4th to April 22nd, 1563). The final form of Canon VIII. stated the legitimacy of "bishops assumed by" Papal authority.

In March both the Cardinals Gonzaga and Seripando died (the latter of fever), both of them respected and lamented. There were intrigues set afoot for the appointment of the Cardinal of Lorraine as president, but Seripando's last request had been for a man of ripe years and experience. Simonetta was distrusted by the Spanish, and had played too decided a part for him to exercise any great control; Hosius could do little for the opposite reason that he had been too colourless; the Cardinal d'Altemps had previously left the Council for Rome: Cardinals Morone and Navagero were therefore appointed (March 7th, 1563). But the change was of less importance, as the legates and Lorraine had by this time spoken frankly to each other, and the influence of the latter was now thrown not against, but along with their authority. Canons VI., VII., and VIII. on the Hierarchy in the form afterwards passed were the results of these negotiations and debates.

Of the new legates, Morone took precedence; his father had been Chancellor of the Duchy of Milan, and had been able to be of service in freeing Clement VII. from captivity;

**Deaths of
the
Cardinals
of Mantua
and
Seripando,
March 2nd
and 17th,
1563.**

**The new
legates.
Morone,
Navagero.**

the son, educated at Padua, when in Holy Orders was soon made Bishop of Modena under twenty-one, and cardinal at thirty-three; he had mixed in German politics as nuncio more than once, especially about the time of the Colloquy of Regensburg, and none had more nearly approached a reconciliation. This success was, however, due as much to his lax opinions as to his skilful diplomacy. He had been a friend of Contarini's, and sympathised with his views on Justification; under Paul IV. he was not only accused of heresy, but thrown into prison, which he only left on that Pope's death (1559). Like other members of this Italian school of thought, he had become a zealous Papalist, scarcely trusted by all his fellow-cardinals; but his German experience was likely to help him at the imperial Court. Cardinal Navagero was a Venetian of good birth, who, as a layman, had been ambassador at various Courts, and only as an elderly widower had sought ordination; he had (1561) been created cardinal, a dignity he deserved by ability, literary and general, and had earned by his devotion to papal interests.

Morone had hardly done more than arrive (April 13th) and deliver his address, when he left Trent for Innsbruck (April 20th), where the Emperor had been for some time, and where the Cardinal of Trent, the Bishop of Fünfkirchen, and the Archbishop of Salzburg, as well as the Cardinal of Lorraine (February 12th, 1563), visited him. Ferdinand had been much influenced by Canisius, and as he gradually discovered the incapacity and unwillingness of the Council to satisfy him, he turned to the Pope. Morone's journey was to ratify the compact, and thus once

more papal diplomacy shot ahead of the Council. But there were difficulties in the position. It was needful, as the Cardinal of Lorraine advised the Emperor, to strengthen the non-Italian element in the Council, and to ask that the ambassadors should make their proposals directly to the Council—the latter being a point which had been urged upon the legates by the ambassadors at Trent. Philip II. had (March) sent to Rome Don Luis de Zuñiga to reinforce Vargas, and the main point of his instructions (December, 1562) was to insist upon the sessions continuing until all matters of faith and heresy were defined: novel opinions should be sternly condemned, and no concessions—such as that of the chalice—should be made. The Spanish ambassadors at Rome also took up the complaint of the Spanish bishops at Trent, pressing for the abolition of the clause which gave the legates the initiative, so that the Council might really become free. But the issue of the Council depended upon the unity of Europe, and that was now once more broken up. Spain rather preferred to see France divided into parties, and at war in itself. The peace between the French king and the Huguenots (March) made the former desire peace; he wished the Council to be transferred to some city in Germany. The position of Lorraine, after the death of his brother the Duke de Guise (February 18th, 1563), was altered, and he was now anxious to bring the Council to a successful end. He returned to Trent (April 20th) from Innsbruck. The Pope found a grievance in the peace with the Huguenots, and the French ambassadors at Rome were very busy (under a Bull of April 7th some French bishops were cited to Rome for sympathy with

Lutherans). The Lorraine family were striving to marry their niece, Mary of Scots, at one time with an imperial, at another with a Spanish prince; and so family interests, tinged by an infusion of religious politics, brought England (where a manly queen must either be married or excommunicated) and Scotland (where a self-seeking nobility and a Calvinistic democracy might be checked) within the diplomacy of Trent. For a time, however, Rome held its hand. But when Morone returned to Trent from Innsbruck (May 27th), he had really won over the Emperor; the Pope was to be supported, and as soon as the Council had ended the chalice should be conceded; Morone had promised large reforms; the Pope had issued some more reforming bulls dealing first with the Rota (September 27th, 1562), and then (January 1st, 1563) with other departments, notably reducing official fees. The Emperor was now seeking for the acknowledgment of his son Maximilian (a strong sympathiser with the Protestants, and most desirous of communion in both kinds) as King of the Romans. He had been elected November 24th, 1562; had been just previously recognised as King of Bohemia, and (September, 1563) was soon to be crowned King of Hungary.

CHAPTER IX

CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL

DURING Morone's absence, when diplomacy was busy and the theologians inclined for rest (they had finished the considerations of Matrimony in March, and by the end of April the Decrees on the abuses in Holy Orders were ready), things moved slowly. In the middle of May Congregations began again; the theologians presented their drafts. Titular bishops (who one prelate roundly declared were an introduction of the devil), the cessation of the Minor Orders, the election of cardinals were commented upon among other things. The Cardinal of Lorraine took the part of a moderator, and mostly set an example of brevity. The Archbishop of Granada spoke much as before. On Morone's arrival many minor quarrels were composed, but the postponed session was once put off to June 15th, once again to July 15th, and finally reached the distinction of being postponed eight times. Two proposals were made to facilitate business: Morone suggested that what was agreed upon should be passed, and the rest left over: the French ambassador, Du Ferrier, proposed to close the Council and leave the task of reform to national synods, whose decisions should come before the Pope for approval. Lorraine and some of the legates approved of this. The Pope was supposed to

be inclined for it; but the course of affairs in France and the danger from Germany made him anxious to close the Council speedily. He therefore left the legates a free hand even in matters touching the Cardinalate and bishops titular and coadjutors. The Decrees on Reform were recommitted, the election of bishops being left over and the condemnation of titular bishops left out. Before the Canons could be passed, a conference of leading Fathers had to be held, at which it was decided to go back to the late Cardinal Gonzaga's form of VII. (taken with VI. and VIII.) on the place of bishops. On June 9th these long-debated Canons were accepted, although even then the Archbishop of Granada, supported by others, stood out to the end for an assertion of the institution of the hierarchy by Christ, instead of its divine ordination (which might mean, it was said, through the Pope). When the session was finally held the Canons and Decrees passed with little dissent and slight alteration.

Session
XXIII.,
July 15th,
1563.

The enunciation of Faith, in four chapters, asserted:

- (1) The union of Sacrifice and priesthood. Christ, therefore, gave to His Apostles and to their successors in the priesthood the power of consecration, of offering and administering His Body and Blood, and also of remitting and retaining sins.
- (2) To show the veneration of so great a Sacrifice seven orders have been in use from the first: among them subdeacon, acolyte, exorcist, lector, ostiarius.
- (3) Holy Orders is one of the Seven Sacraments, since grace is conferred in it and this is accomplished with words and signs.
- (4) Orders confer an indelible character. Not all

Decrees
on Holy
Orders.
Minor
Orders.

Christians are priests. Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, specially pertain to the hierarchy. They are superior to priests, confer Confirmation, and ordain. For the promotion of bishops, priests, and other orders, no consent or calling by people or secular power is needed.

An incident in the preparation of the Decrees on Holy Orders illustrates the Council's difficulty of being sufficiently detailed for precision, and yet not being too minute. The legates had prepared a long Chapter on the seven orders, and when this left the hands of the theologians it included long definitions of the duties of each order. This involved much detail, and the minuteness was reasonably objected to. The Cardinal of Lorraine suggested that the care of the details might well be left to the bishops, who should now be charged to exercise a stricter control. The lengthy provisions were therefore left out. But where, as in many matters touching benefices, new regulations were desired, a like course could not be taken. A large assembly, in which nearly every member understands even the details of the matters treated of, finds great difficulty in coming to a conclusion.

In explanation of the Conciliar Decree under Paul III., it was explained that all, even cardinals (this extension to them was due to the Cardinal of Lorraine), should reside, unless for causes approved by the Pope, the Metropolitan, or his deputy. Absentees were to receive no income. All those appointed to cathedral churches, even cardinals, are to receive consecration within three months of their appointment, under pain of losing the income. Six months' delay shall entail depriva-

**Reforma-
tion.**

tion. Major and Minor Orders were guarded by rules as to the need of testimonials, character, knowledge, and vocation. Fraudulent withdrawal from secular jurisdiction by receiving the tonsure is to be guarded against. None under fourteen years of age, even if in Minor Orders, is to receive a benefice, or to have benefit of clergy (*i.e.* exemption from secular jurisdiction) unless holding a benefice and wearing the ecclesiastical dress and tonsure. A knowledge of Latin was demanded, except in special cases, for Minor Orders. The lives of those admitted shall be watched over, and none shall be admitted who is not likely to proceed to Major Orders. For promotions in Orders proper interstices of time are to be carefully observed. Ages for the Major Orders were fixed—twenty-two for subdeacon, twenty-three for deacon, twenty-five for priest. Strict regulations as to testimonials were made, and the lives of those ordained were to be marked by piety, continence, and frequent communions, special emphasis being laid on the sacredness of the priesthood. No one shall be ordained in future unless attached to a particular church, and no wandering priest without letters from his bishop shall be allowed to celebrate. To further the restoration of the Minor Orders, which in many places had fallen into disuse, no unordained person was to perform their special offices. Bishops were to try and restore the Minor Orders in parishes of sufficient population and revenue, assigning stipends to those ordained. Failing unmarried clerks, competent married men, if not twice married, and if wearing the tonsure and clerical dress, might be employed. All cathedral churches are to be bound to keep and educate a number of youths of the diocese

proportional to their means and the size of the diocese, in a neighbouring college chosen by the bishop. These youths are to be twelve years old and likely for the ministry. A preference is to be given to the poor. Wealthy children desirous for the training are to pay for themselves. The boys are to wear the tonsure and clerical dress, attend Mass daily, act as servers, confess once a month, and receive the Communion at their confessor's direction. Their education is to be liberal as well as ecclesiastical. These seminaries are to be under the bishop's care. Besides funds set apart for education, a certain part of capitular, parochial, and all ecclesiastical revenues is to be taken for their maintenance. These rules were to be enforced. To lessen the cost of teaching, ordinaries may compel scholastics to teach as they direct. In cases of poverty, one seminary may be provided from two churches. In case of a wealthy diocese, two seminaries may be founded.

Provisions for ecclesiastical order and for education had once been ample, but had been corrupted or laxly enforced. These difficulties were now intensified by the number of monks who were leaving the monasteries and by the controversies of the Reformation. These Decrees were a fair endeavour to reform abuses. The existence of unfit priests, scandalous ordination, clerical exemption from jurisdiction, negligence of bishops—all of which had wrought untold mischief—were now to be restrained. The place of the old monastic schools was now to be supplied by these episcopal seminaries. It was a return to primitive and early medieval models,

although the boldness of the financial provisions savoured of an age of secularisation of benefices. Henceforth, if bishops did their duty, there could be no lack of fit ordinands. On the one hand, some have traced the greater coherence of dioceses, the heightened respect for the priesthood, the higher standard of clerical life, to this particular Decree for the founding of seminaries. On the other hand, some have seen in it a cause of the too common separation between clergy and laity—an aloofness, sometimes exaggerated, of one from the other. Probably there is truth in both contentions. But of the importance of holding up clerical vocation before the young there should be no question, even if individual cases prove failures. For a special work, needing not only gifts of disposition and learning, but also of spirit and self-sacrifice, a special education is needed. The fault, if fault there were, did not lie here. It was easy for small institutions to drift into a low idea of education. The seminaries could not rise higher than the aims of the bishop himself, and were liable to abuses not so likely to arise in larger colleges. Seminaries have done an immense work in providing for the needs of the Church; but they have too often suffered from an unreality of tone and a too great conservatism in methods. The conception of their foundation was happy: the method of their administration has sometimes fallen short of it. No provision did more for the efficiency and the adequate machinery of the Church, but there was need of a constant adaptation to the needs of the time and of a high ideal of education, spiritual and intellectual. Some German dioceses, and notably Würzburg, were soon to become illustrations of the working of this

Decree, and it fitted in well with the work of the Jesuits.

When so much had been done, the legates began to think of closing the Council speedily, but De Luna (the Spanish Ambassador) opposed this, and also Morone's scheme (afterwards adopted) of preparing business by two small committees of theologians and Fathers respectively. Since the beginning of the year directions from Rome had enjoined upon the legates conciliation of Lorraine, and their policy had accordingly changed towards him. His visit to Rome (September 18th) set a seal to the attempt to come to terms with him. But there was now arising between the Spanish and the French a jealousy which was illustrated by an incident of S. Peter's Day. At Mass a special chair was placed for De Luna, in obedience to the Pope's command, to give him an equality with the French representative. Lorraine and the French threatened withdrawal, and even a renunciation of obedience to Pope Pius. After much consultation, the incident was closed, but it had, however, caused much heartburning, and left some behind it. It was partly a sequel to this that the Spanish Court once more raised the question of the initiative as to subjects, proposing to throw it open to the Council at large, and even (which would have been an innovation) to the ambassadors (September, 1563). But all desired the end, and preparations for the next session went on, although the Count de Luna pressed for schedules of reform being prepared by the bishops of each nation and then discussed. In the end, a French, a Spanish and an Italian committee were appointed to digest the business, with a view to an early ending.

The details of marriage, rather than the general principles, led to debate. Broadly speaking, the original view of the Church was to regard the union of man and woman as a natural sacrament, sanctified by, and corresponding to, the union of Christ and His Church. Therefore the Church blessed it, and grouped around it ceremonies which not only recognised its holiness, but emphasised it to the world. From its original sacredness, and from Christ's words, there resulted its inviolability, except for some previous obstacle to marriage between the parties. And, in spite of an increasing tendency to base the sacredness of marriage upon the Church's blessing on it rather than upon its sacramental force, the sacredness of marriage had been well taught, and firmly maintained, by the medieval Church. The Lutherans and other Protestants had, however, lowered the conception of marriage, and proposals to allow remarriage after a divorce following adultery, and to allow desertion or crime to annul marriage, had found favour with them. But with one exception, the Council had no wish even to discuss anything of this kind. That exception was when some of the Venetian bishops would have liked to allow remarriage to a man divorcing an adulterous wife. In the Eastern lands subject to Venice this was done by dispensation from the Eastern Church, and they therefore wished not to condemn the practice. To meet their views, merely those who condemned the Church for her stricter view were anathematised, not those who only differed from her; at the same time the permanency of marriage even in this case was reasserted as the

Marriage.

Re-marriage after divorce.

Church's view when the assertion was of peculiar value. The Council did much for the world in this one respect alone. The rarity of divorce in Canada—due mainly to the influence of the French Catholics in the Province of Quebec—compared with the frequency of it in the United States may illustrate the social importance of its action.

But while the general principles were clear, the machinery of the details of matrimony was complicated, and much in need of reform. The gradual extension of the doctrine of affinities, natural, spiritual (by the relation of sponsorship), and irregular or sinful connections, had complicated Church law; the jurisdiction of Church Courts, and the issue of dispensations, were both at their worst in matrimonial causes. There were further national differences in use, such as the English steady denial of the legitimatisation of children by their parents' subsequent marriage, and the French denial of validity to clandestine marriages. The discussions were therefore of necessity long, while the matter was of the utmost importance, social and religious, and especially so in an age of growing licence and lessened restraint. So keen was the discussion, and so desirable was it to get a perfectly free opinion, that all non-voters were excluded from the final congregation (November 10th).

The much-prolonged debate from July to September caused an adjournment of the session from September 16th to November 11th, the first General Congregation on Marriage being held on September 7th. The majority thought that marriage, even when not blessed by a priest, was a sacrament, and that possibly in annulling a marriage, clandestine or irregular from lack of con-

sent, the essence of the sacrament might be interfered with. It thus became with some of the Fathers a matter of faith; and Hosius, who held strong opinions of this kind, would not attend the session itself.

Marriage was declared a sacrament, instituted by Christ Himself and not by men, and therefore conferring grace; polygamy, dissolution of marriage by heresy, incompatibility, or desertion were condemned. Not only the Levitical degrees of consanguinity and affinity, but others set up by the Church are valid, and from some of the Levitical prohibitions the Church can dispense. The Church can establish impediments to marriage; matrimony contracted, but not consummated, can

Session
XXIV.,
Nov. 11th,
1563.
Holy
matrimony.
Twelve
Canons.
Ten
Chapters.

be dissolved by one party making a profession of religion (*i.e.* taking vows). The Church had not erred in declaring that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved by adultery; the innocent party cannot remarry, to do which is adultery. The Church can, for many causes, decree separation *a mensa et thoro* (sometimes loosely called *divortium*). Clerks who have vowed chastity cannot marry, and a feeling of a lack of the gift of chastity (which God is able to give) does not justify the breach of vows. The state of virginity, or celibacy, is to be preferred before that of marriage; prohibition of marriage at certain seasons, and the benediction and other ceremonies used by the Church in marriage, are not superstitions. Matrimonial causes belong to ecclesiastical judges. These affirmations were made by Canons anathematising those who maintained opposite opinions.

The Decree of Reformation of Marriage declared

the Church's dislike of clandestine marriages, and of those made without the leave of parents, although such marriages are valid until declared otherwise by the Church; validity does not depend upon parental consent; as a safeguard triple publication of banns and marriage by the parish priest before witnesses in the face of the Church are decreed. Marriage otherwise was void, and the priest punishable: it must be celebrated by the parish priest or his deputy; any other priest celebrating a marriage is *ipso facto* suspended; a register of marriages is to be kept; confession and reception of the Holy Eucharist are to precede marriage. Pious provincial customs other than these are to be kept also. This decree was to be explained carefully, and published in every parish, and to come into force thirty days after publication. Spiritual affinity was restricted by the regulation that one, or at the most two, of each sex should receive the infant from the baptism (*i.e.* as sponsor); spiritual affinity was to exist between them, and the priest baptising, and the baptised, and the parents of the baptised; the names of these godparents were to be registered; so in confirmation, substituting the sponsor there for the sponsor in baptism. The impediment of public honesty was restrained. Affinity arising from fornication was confined to the first and second degree. Marriage within the prohibited degree, unless through ignorance, was to lead to separation, without any hope of dispensation. Dispensations for marriages were to be given rarely, for good cause and gratuitously; they should be granted within the second degree in the case of great princes only, and for a public cause. Marriage was

prohibited from Advent to Epiphany, and from Ash Wednesday to Low Sunday.

In addition to previous Decrees, the creation of bishops was further regulated. Vacancies were to be the subject of prayer. Those who appointed were to remember their responsibilities and choose suitable men satisfying the Canons. Each province in its synod was to prescribe suitable forms of scrutiny, to be approved

**Reforma-
tion.
Twenty-
one
Chapters.**

by the Pope. When the scrutiny was satisfied, the result in a document should be sent to the Pope, who should then confirm. All the documents should be examined by a cardinal, with three other cardinals as assessors. They should report to the Consistory, declaring their conscientious belief. In the next Consistory (unless the Pope should regulate otherwise) the sentence of appointment should issue. Like regulations were made for the College of Cardinals, which was to be chosen out of all the nations of Christendom. Finally, his solemn responsibility in these appointments was urged upon the Pope. It should be noted that these Decrees as to the confirmation of bishops were made more precise by Gregory XIII. (1591) and Urban VIII. (1627). Before 1563 the whole process had taken place in Rome. The Pope usually set in charge of it one of the cardinals—for choice the Protector in the Sacred College of the nation concerned. He or his secretary received the evidence—information from persons then in Rome for the purpose or by coincidence—and presented the result (often embodying details as to situation and condition of the Church) to the Consistory, which, as a rule, immediately passed

**Election of
bishops
and con-
firmation.**

the confirmation. But after 1563 the investigation was made on the spot by a papal commissary, in most cases the nuncio to the nation. A protocol drawn up by him and forwarded to Rome was then considered by a committee of cardinals, who brought it and their recommendation before the Consistory. The new process was less of a formality, and while more satisfactory on the local side, greatly strengthened the control of the Papacy. The improvement in bishops of this new type is illustrated well by the case of German dioceses.

Provincial synods were to meet every three years, diocesan every year. Bishops not subject to a Metropolitan were to attend some neighbouring synod. All bishops were to make yearly visitations (even exempt churches were to be visited). In the larger dioceses two years were allowed for the circuit. All inferior visitors were to be regular, and report to the bishop. Too great luxury and pomp in visitations were forbidden, and their true purpose was emphasised. Fees for visitations were limited to food that was needed, or its equivalent. No appeal or delay was to suspend Decrees for correction made by visitors. No honorary titles or offices, papal or royal, were to withdraw their holders from episcopal control. Bishops were to preach in their own churches themselves or by deputies; in parish churches, the parish priests or persons chosen. Sermons were to be given on all Sundays and festivals, and in Advent and Lent daily, or every other day at least. Children were to be instructed at least on all Lord's Days and festivals. Grave causes against bishops were to go before the Pope, others before

provincial councils. Cases reserved for absolution by a bishop were defined. Bishops and priests were to explain the sacraments in the vernacular, if need be, and in a form to be prescribed in a catechism. A public penance was to be laid on public sinners, and a suitable penitentiary, with a prebend annexed to his office, should be appointed in all cathedrals. Suitable men were to be chosen for canons and archdeacons. Any appointed to a benefice were within two months to make a profession of faith in the presence of the bishop or of his official, and swear obedience to the Roman Church. Holders of cathedral offices were also to do the same in chapter. Regulations were made to shut out unordained, too young, or absentee holders of cathedral offices, and the behaviour of chapters was regulated. If convenient, half of cathedral offices were to be held by doctors, masters, or licentiates in theology or law. Provision was made for the union of parishes where it was desirable. No pensions or reservations were to be fixed on churches with less than a certain limit of endowment, and no charges on stipends except for pious uses. The previous regulations against pluralities were repeated. The nomination and institution of parish priests were regulated, and those appointed had to satisfy selected examiners. Mandates *de providendo* (provisions) were forbidden even where cardinals were to benefit. Expectatives (grants in expectation) were forbidden, and also mental reservations (those which specified no name). All ecclesiastical cases, except those which by Canon or evocation went before the Pope, were to go first before the ordinary, and to be decided within two years. Matrimonial and criminal cases were not left

to archdeacons and lower judges, but reserved for bishops. Legates were not to interfere with episcopal justice, or even proceed in cases without episcopal cognisance. Other regulations improved procedure. Certain words (viz. "on the proposition of the legates and presidents") were not to be understood as changing the routine of business in General Councils. (This was the settlement of the much-debated clause.)

Much discussion had arisen upon the reformation of princes. The Middle Ages had such a vivid conception of the Church as an entity—the

**The Re-
formation
of princes.**

division between spiritual and temporal was so much more a division between functions

than between the men who exercised them—that the medieval theory of Church and State was very different from the modern. The State had to attend to religion; the King had to act for the Church; although neither the State nor the King could perform spiritual functions. The Church had allowed the State to do much

**Medieval
theory.**

in matters we should call purely ecclesiastical. It had expected the State to give it a large and indefinite amount of help in cases

of heresy or those where force was needed. The Middle Ages could quite well see a bishop acting spiritually in one of his capacities and acting temporally in another; he had, as it were, a double personality. The monarch in a State could similarly act in his civil and in his religious capacities. There was here what some modern critics would call a confusion, and it seems easier to us to divide society into sharply defined classes of spiritual men and temporal men. Church and State become at the same time opposed corporations instead of different aspects of the same thing.

Exemptions of clerks from secular jurisdiction, interference of princes in religious and ecclesiastical matters, were natural but opposed results of the medieval theory. To deal properly with the whole matter of Church and State there would have been needed a theory clearly thought out and an adequate review of existing facts, for medieval institutions and growths needed some enlargement and some adaptation. But, on the one hand, the bishops were urgent for a reform of secular princes—and this meant to them much interference with the jurisdiction princes exercised and rights that they had long enjoyed; on the other hand, political interests made it a very difficult matter to curtail the privileges of princes. The Conciliar theories of the fifteenth century had expressed in the ecclesiastical sphere the sovereignty of the people. The growth of the papal monarchy had, on the other hand, negatived that sovereignty in the same sphere. There had seemed nothing strange a century and a half before in a Council all but solely composed of ecclesiastics legislating for Christendom. Now, as soon as the Council undertook the reform of princes, they were told it was wrong they should legislate for the laity. The growth of national sovereignty was one characteristic of the day, and it answered with something of defiance to the other theories of the papal monarchy and Conciliar power.

In July the whole question of reform had been discussed with the representatives of the three nations, and especially the French and the imperialists. All three were very strong upon the reform of the College of Cardinals. Forty-two Chapters on Reformation were proposed, but, by

Course of
the nego-
tiations.

omitting six, were reduced to thirty-six. Those omitted concerned tithes, lessening the number of Masses, excommunication, the prohibition to the clergy of mingling in secular matters, the control of the revenue of vacant benefices, and impediments to reform caused by secular persons. The last of these was the celebrated Reformation of Princes. These thirty-six Decrees were considered (August 21st), and reduced to twenty, to which a twenty-first, explaining the "proposal" clause, was added (p. 230). The Emperor and Philip of Spain protested against the Decrees about the temporal power. The King of France (with many causes of complaint, and not now well served by the cardinal and his bishops, as instanced by their not supporting in the debates the French demand to allow marriage of priests) ordered his Ambassadors to protest, and if their protest were useless, to withdraw: so they withdrew (September). De Luna had added to the embarrassment by bringing up the question of the "proposal" clause. On the other hand, one hundred bishops signed an engagement to stand aloof from the Council if this reform of princes were left aside. But when the Cardinal of Lorraine came back from Rome (November 5th), the Pope bade the legates close the Council speedily, pass the Decree on clandestine marriage as best they could, and deal firmly with difficulties. As to the reformation of princes and jurisdiction over ecclesiastics, they were to renew the ancient Canons and add no anathema. If difficulties arose upon other articles, they were to refer to him, and for the rest they were to work with the cardinal, who knew his mind. The previous Decrees were to be confirmed; the continuity of the Council throughout declared; the papal power

was not to be touched: the Council was to ask for papal confirmation of its Decrees; the Fathers were to sign the Decrees, and the ambassadors to do the same for their masters. When the twenty-one clauses had been disposed of in September, the remainder came up for discussion, so that questions arising out of the Decrees afterwards passed in Session XXV. were now causing irritation before Session XXIV.

This Chapter proposed for the reform of princes asserted that clerks were not to be judged save by ecclesiastics; all cases touching the Church were to go before ecclesiastical judges; temporal judges were not to sit upon ecclesiastical cases, and clerks admitting their jurisdiction were subject to suspension; temporal authorities were not to command an ecclesiastical judge either to withdraw excommunication or to suspend judgment; emperors and princes were not to make decrees for ecclesiastical persons or cases, but were to lend their help to ecclesiastical courts; the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical judges was not to be disturbed; subjects of ecclesiastics were not to be called before secular judges in temporal cases. Princes were not to promise benefices by brief or importune bishops and chapters for their bestowal. They were not to seize the fruits of vacant benefices or appoint to them vicars or stewards. They were not to force payment of taxes upon Church property or the private property of ecclesiastics, except where ancient custom in the case of war against infidels justified their doing so. They were not to touch the goods of communities or of the Church. Proclamations and edicts of Church courts—especially those from Rome—were to be published at

**Chapter on
Reforma-
tion of
Princes.**

once, and without waiting for a *Placet* from the State. The right of claiming hospitality from monasteries was taken away from princes and magistrates. Any realm or province claiming exemption from these rules was to enter the claim within a year, so that it might receive papal confirmation; otherwise the claim was bad. By an addition to the clauses, all previous Decrees upon clerical exemptions were renewed.

This lengthy and exhaustive Chapter—represented in the result by Chapter XX: in Session XXV., which merely recommended clerical communities and the rights of the Church to the care of princes and renewed all previous Canons—would have made permanent some of the worst medieval defects, and would have been as ruinous to the Church as to the State. It was small wonder it caused opposition, and it was happy for the Church that it all but disappeared.

But there were minor difficulties to be dealt with. The Spanish bishops, already in opposition to the legates on many points, objected strongly to the manipulation of the Chapter on Reform by the deputation, composed mainly of Italians. They further wished to see less independence given to cathedral chapters (Chapter VI., Session XXV., was also under consideration now), and the provision by which criminal charges against bishops were to be dealt with at Rome seemed to strike a blow at the Spanish Inquisition. The Portuguese bishops raised a like objection, and it was felt even more strongly by the monarchs of the countries. About this time it may be noted that the rumours of the intended introduction of the Inquisition into Milan

The Inquisition.

caused great anger among the Italian bishops, who feared for their own jurisdiction. Hence the bitterness between Spanish and Italian, due to many causes, intensified the Italian opposition, fostered by letters from officials at Rome, on the question of reform. But the legates showed a great desire to come to terms, and Visconti, Bishop of Ventimiglia, left Rome as Papal Ambassador to Spain (end of October). After many attempts at drafting, a satisfactory wording of the Chapter on the initiative was happily reached (p. 230). The legates could not risk having Spain also against them, as now Du Ferrier, along with some bishops, had withdrawn to Venice soon after his protest (September 22nd). The Pope's action, indeed, was now very hostile to France. The condemnation of the Queen Jeanne of Navarre (October 22nd) for heresy and the deprivation by the Pope of the six French bishops previously (April 7th) cited to Rome had increased the tension between the Curia and France. All the diplomacy of Lorraine was needed, and he found it well to come back by way of Venice to procure Du Ferrier's return to Trent. In this, however, he failed. (It may be noted that another Ambassador, De Luna, was never able to leave Trent, for he died there (December 18th) of an illness ascribed to the evil effects of fruit and bad water.) Some of these differences were seen on the day of session itself. The Bishops of Naples and Lombardy expressed their fears about the Inquisition, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, by a formal protest at variance with his secret professions, saved the ancient rights of the French Crown and Monarchy. But, as a matter of fact, the Gallican liberties had always been a euphemism for royal con-

trol. It was more significant that he also added that he received these reforms as part of a more general scheme. In many respects such an expectation was vain. It seemed, for instance, that, under Session XXIV., Chapter XIV., annates would disappear, but they were still levied by right of the papal privilege under Session XXV., Chapter XXI.

Other incidents about now made it only natural that bishops should feel their position uneasy. Bartolomé de Carranza (born 1503) had been a zealous and prominent Dominican at Valladolid (where he was professor), in England under Mary, and in Flanders. He had been Imperial Theologian (1546-7 and 1551-2) at Trent, and, after twice refusing sees, became in 1557 Archbishop of Toledo, in which dignity Paul IV. readily confirmed him. In this office he was zealous and able, and gave the last rites to Charles V. The publication of a catechism at Antwerp in 1558 brought him under notice (August, 1559) by the Inquisition, the rival Dominican, Melchior Cano, and Ferdinand de Valdez, Archbishop of Seville and Grand Inquisitor, having already enmities against him. His trial lasted two years, and after the prisoner's condemnation a difference arose between the Conciliar committee for the Index and the Spanish Inquisition. His theology was certainly Erasmian, and was held Lutheran. Tried by the Spanish standard, it was heterodox in 141 propositions; to the Fathers at Trent it seemed vague but harmless. A papal bull had authorised his seizure; but the Archbishop appealed to the Pope. The Fathers at Trent decided against the Inquisition's judgment, and asked Pius IV. to interpose. Philip II. resisted this inter-

ference, and the case went on until Pius V., under threat of an interdict (December, 1566), forced the King to send the Archbishop to Rome. Under Gregory XIII. judgment was at last given: Carranza was to abjure sixteen articles, perform certain penances, and remain in an honourable captivity, while his catechism was forbidden (April 14, 1576). Three weeks later he died, recanting his errors and receiving papal absolution. That he had not always conducted himself cautiously might be true, but he suffered mainly because he carried opinions on justification, at one time common, into a day when they became both uncommon and suspected.

The Patriarch of Venice had also brought himself under suspicion, but his trial by a commission of twenty-five bishops led to his acquittal (1563). He too was accused of Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, and he too, like Carranza, had brought upon himself much ill-will by his strict enforcement of clerical discipline.

There were thus difficulties enough without debating the detailed Reformation of Princes. It had been feared already that some Decrees of Session XXII. on last wills and appointments might lead to trouble with the princes, and these fresh topics did more. There was great activity in private congregations, and much diplomacy centring in and around the Cardinal of Lorraine. In the end, two-thirds of the Fathers approved of the Decrees for Session XXIV., but some wished to leave the disputed matters to the Pope. Nor was this done merely in the interest of any theory or doctrine of his primacy, but rather as a detail of organisation and as a means of escaping the give-and-

take and compromise of a popular assembly. There were also those who strove, not from any conscious prejudice, but from a belief in their position, to preserve their privileges. Some bishops, for instance, sought to restrain their metropolitans, and they were, indeed, now freed from the onerous duty of visiting their superior metropolitans once a year. There were also regulars who objected to the power over them given to bishops—which was an innovation, and one greatly needed. But everything was now hurrying to an end. The theologians had already been considering indulgences and vows, although an attempt to encourage brevity by demanding their views in writing had merely resulted in the production of lengthy documents. The next session was fixed for December 9th, or earlier if possible.

The Pope was greatly pleased at what had been done, and urged equal speed again. The leading cardinals and prelates—twenty-five in number—met and digested the business that remained. The subjects of purgatory, invocation of saints, and the use of images needed little fresh Conciliar explanation; but an utterance of the Sorbonne upon images presented by the Cardinal of Lorraine was highly praised. On November 15th the General Congregation began, and the unanimity now seen contrasted greatly with the differences before the last session. On an urgent representation by Lorraine that coadjutor bishops were of great service in France, especially in monasteries (their existence made easy the abuse of appointing merely nominal abbots), their office was not abolished; but their appointment was to be only for grave cause.

Preparations for the close of the Council.

Among the additions made to the original draft were those on the manner of episcopal life, the possession of tithes by laymen, the use of excommunication, and the provision of a record office in each diocese. On reformation of regulars twenty-two Chapters were prepared, and their discussion only lasted four days. By December 2nd everything excepting a Decree upon Indulgence was ready, and it was suggested that this difficult and contested subject had better be left out. The news of the Pope's illness that came from Rome made everyone wish to close, and De Luna's intrigues for postponement became useless. Some thought the Chapter on secular princes insufficient, but the insufficiency was intentional. Most of the business was agreed to at the session upon December 3rd, but an adjournment was made to the next day for everything to be included. The legates, anxious to please, and conscious that the subject merited a decision, drafted in the interval a Decree upon Indulgence; and this again passed with slight change. It had contained a clause forbidding the payment of any money for the procuring of an indulgence; but the Spaniards pointed out that this would apply to the Spanish Cruzada—a form of indulgence for Spain the proceeds of which, gained by the compulsory purchase of copies of the bull, went to the King. Although some twenty bishops wished to keep the words, they were therefore struck out. The zeal of princes for reform did not go very deep, and both France and Spain had been lately seeking from the Curia leave to alienate or tax ecclesiastical revenues at the moment of their sharpest differences with it.

Session
XXV.,
December
3rd, 4th.

The Decree on Purgatory referred to the previous Decrees of Sessions VI. and XXII. affirming the existence of Purgatory, wherein souls are helped by prayer of the faithful, especially by the Mass. This doctrine was to be explained to congregations, but more subtle questions or uncertain points were to be left aside. Anything savouring of filthy lucre was to be prohibited. All works of piety for the faithful dead were to be duly and devoutly rendered.

Invocation of saints. The intercession and invocation of saints, the honour paid to relics, and the use of images were also to be expounded. Saints were to be invoked and their aid asked in gaining benefits from God through Christ, the only Redeemer. The relics, a source of benefit to men, were to be honoured. Images are to be retained (specially in churches) and honoured, not as having any virtue or divinity in themselves, or to be invoked, but because honour paid to them is referred to their prototypes. Paintings and other representations instruct people, and miracles also attest their value. All abuses as to images, by which false doctrine could be taught, the Council wished abolished. Unlettered people were to be taught that images could not represent the Divinity. All superstitions, all filthy lucre, in the invocation of saints, relics, and images, were to be abolished. A too sensual beauty in works of art and revelling or drunkenness in celebrating saints' days were to be avoided. To gain these ends bishops were to use diligence. No unusual image is to be placed, no miracle acknowledged or relic recognised without episcopal leave, and assessors may be called in by the bishop in deciding such matters. If questions arise or an abuse has to be ended, the bishop shall

await a provincial council. Nothing new or unusual in the church shall even then be done without consulting the Pope. It may be noted that in these two Decrees signs of hasty drafting are to be found, not only in their inconclusiveness (strangely at contrast with some earlier Decrees), but also in the mingling of condemnations of erroneous views with enunciation of those affirmed as true. This method was not so clear as that of separating the views condemned in Canons.

Opinions will always differ as to the state of monasteries before the Reformation. The diversities of countries, orders, and local influences should be allowed for, and when that is done generalisations are obviously dangerous. Monastic Orders, like everything else, need both reorganisation from time to time and a constant renewal of their early enthusiasm. In many cases the needs they had once satisfied had either disappeared or changed their shape, and so the Orders lacked their former stimulus. But it was admitted—and no one had put the case more strongly than had monastic reformers, and nowhere was it stated more vigorously than at Trent—that reform was needed: not the reform the German princes spoke of, which was merely secularisation or diversion of funds, but a reform based upon spiritual objects and discipline of life. It was now decreed that all regulars were to obey their Rule strictly. Superiors, in chapters and by visitations, were to see to this. Individual monks were restrained in their possession of property. The number of inmates of a monastic house was to depend on its income, and no new houses were to be formed

Reformation of regulars. Twenty-two Chapters.

without the leave of the diocesan bishop. Closure was to be strictly enforced, and elections of superiors were to be by secret voting. All monasteries directly under the Pope, must within a year form themselves into congregations with suitable statutes. If they did not carry out this Decree, the Metropolitan was to see to it. The control of bishops over exempt nunneries, monastic parishes, and other details, was made stringent. Episcopal censures, interdicts, and feasts were to be published and observed in their churches by regulars. All those disputes about precedence which so often cause scandal were to be settled by the bishop. No man or woman was to make profession under sixteen and before a year's probation, and renunciations of property were carefully guarded against abuse. Girls above twelve wishing to take the habit were to be questioned by the ordinary then and before making their profession, and left free from coercion. Since abuses sprang from maladministration in monasteries (most of the evils, we may note, could really be traced to this), the Council trusted that the Pope would make it his care to see that over those monasteries held *in commendam* there should be appointed regulars of the same order and suitable for their task. All these Decrees were to be carried into effect at once.

Considering the disorder into which monastic life had fallen through the numbers breaking their vows, the above scheme was a capable and conscientious effort at reform. It greatly enlarged the powers of bishops and lessened the evils of exemption. So far as legislation could, it restored discipline and the observance of rules. One of the regulations, such as that which made the numbers of inmates in the poorer

houses depend upon their revenue, struck at real evils, for it was in the smaller houses that evils mainly flourished. Others, such as those for visitation and administration, were meant to prevent the financial disorder and the embezzlement which had ruined so many houses. But these Decrees, however admirable and far-reaching, needed a high ideal on the part of those administering them and of those governed. It was of the utmost importance, therefore, that they were issued just when the ideals of episcopal care and spiritual life (as seen in the widespread monastic revivals) were being greatly raised. The Decrees for reformation strengthened the hands of those who were raising these ideals. They, in their turn, prevented these Decrees becoming what other Decrees, as well meant if not so thoroughgoing, had often become—a dead letter. These Decrees were not in themselves a monastic revival, but they reflected the spirit of a revival which had already begun.

There were many things in the life of the secular clergy, too, that had not yet been reformed; and these were next dealt with. Cardinals, bishops, and all holding benefices were to shun nepotism and live simply, remembering that their lives are a sermon. In the next provincial synod all the Conciliar Decrees were to be received, obedience to the Pontiff to be professed, and all heresies named in the Canons anathematised. In future all bishops were to do the same in their first provincial synod. All beneficed clerks and those with University charges were to take oaths to these Decrees. Universities were to be corrected and reformed by the visitors, and the Pope

**Further
reforma-
tion of
seculars
and
chapters.**

would take care this was done for Universities under him. Excommunications were to be sparingly used, and when meant as enforcements of admonitions by bishops only; in criminal cases only after two monitions and public notice; interdicts also were only to be a last resort. In the case of churches where the number of Masses to be said is excessive, the Bishop or General should regulate as he thought fit, provided all the departed founders be commemorated. All conditions or obligations attached to all benefices or prebends should be observed. The procedure of episcopal visitations in exempted chapters was regulated. No access or regress (rights of accession after a vacancy and resumption after a term of years) should apply to benefices. Coadjutor bishops or abbots should only be appointed by leave of the Pope. Hospitality was enjoined upon all holders of benefices, and the administration of hospitals was further regulated. Titles to patronage must be proved; privileges not proved were abrogated except when assigned to cathedrals, kings, and Universities. Unfit persons presented by the patron might be rejected by the bishop; endowments were guarded against patrons. Synods were to appoint persons from whom the Pope should select judges to try local cases. All judges were exhorted to decide cases speedily. All leases and farmings out of ecclesiastical offices were prohibited. Tithes should be properly paid under pain of excommunication. The procedure against clerks who kept concubines was regulated: a fine of a third part of their revenue, and after two admonitions deprivation, was to be imposed by the bishop. Bishops offending in this way and not heeding the admonitions of the provincial were *ipso facto* suspended, and left to be

punished by the Pope. Illegitimate sons of clerks were excluded from benefices or churches connected with their fathers. Bishops were not to be servile before kings and nobles, but to maintain their office. Canons were to be strictly kept, and dispensation from them given only for fit cause. Duelling was prohibited; those involved in it should be excommunicated. The immunities and all rights of the Church were recommended to all secular princes, to be observed by them, their subjects, and officials. All ancient Canons in favour of ecclesiastics and the liberty of the Church and against its violators were renewed. And, lastly, all things decreed in the Council for reformation under Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV., were to be so understood as not to touch the authority of the Apostolic See. (This last was a reservation which covered much ground and had a wide effect.)

It should be noted that some of these Decrees formed part of the original forty-two (p. 231); some of them partly repeated, partly enlarged previous Decrees. A tightening of ecclesiastical authority in the Pope and in the bishop marks many of them. Some, as that against duelling and that for clerical immunities, could not well be enforced without the help of the temporal power; but here the Council, like earlier assemblies, claimed to be legislating for Christendom. Not only, however, were there lands where its authority was not regarded, but the temporal power everywhere was taking up a new position with regard to the Church's commands. It was otherwise, however, with the Decrees dealing with persons or matters solely within the ecclesiastical sphere. Here, even if the Decrees (as those against concubinary priests and

those enforcing the Canons) only repeated medieval Decrees, it was certain that they would be now more strictly kept. The Council, in spite of difficulties, had tried to give coherence to the Church organisation. It had benefited by the spectacle of religious organisations, especially the Calvinistic, which had a logical order and a certain effect. Henceforth the spirit of the Spanish Church and its ideal of strictness were to be those of the whole Roman obedience. But many allowances had to be made for local variations and customs. The exception by which the papal authority, capable of great uses, and equally of great abuses, was left untouched was so large that the working of the Tridentine scheme could not be expected to equal its ideal. But there was hardly a blemish of ecclesiastical life that was not dealt with. It remained a fair attempt at a large legislation.

Strangely enough, the subject of indulgences, upon which much had been said and written inside and outside the Council, remained to be somewhat hastily dealt with. Morone would have left it out altogether as too difficult. Their use was defined as ancient, and granted by Christ; as most salutary for Christians, and approved by Councils; but moderation was to be observed in granting them. Desiring to correct the abuses which had led heretics to blaspheme, the Council abolished all evil gains for obtaining them—a prolific cause of abuse. As to all other abuses, proceeding from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or other cause, all bishops were to collect them and report them in the first provincial synod. After review there they were to be reported to the Pope, so that he might ordain suitably. The

gift of indulgence would thus be piously and incorruptly dispensed to all the faithful.

Chapter IX. of Session XXI. had dealt with the questers and regulated the publication of indulgences: the present Decree added somewhat. The doctrine was left as it had been before, and so was still indeterminate upon some issues. With the disappearance of the questers the worst abuses went, but the machinery of the last Decree was cumbrous, however excellent its intentions were. It laid a heavy burden upon the Pope, which it might have been better to leave upon the diocesan bishop, but to do this was in accord with the tendency of papal centralisation. The working of the Decree had to be left for future history to test; and even then there were many causes at work other than the Decree likely to alter, not the doctrine, but the practice. The doctrine remained as before. It was to be taken along with the Decree on Purgatory in the same session, Canon VI., Session VI., and Chapter II., Session XXII. (on the Sacrifice of the Mass as a propitiation). The existence of a purgatory, penal in its nature, during their sojourn in which souls are helped by means of prayer (*per modum suffragii*), and mostly by the Mass, was asserted: the Catechism stated it more definitely. But the continued issue of indulgences, even when freed from the worst abuses, left the demands of reformers still unsatisfied. The more primitive view, restricting the indulgence to the temporal penalty imposed by the Church, was supplemented by the later medieval view (due rather to speculation supporting practice) extending it to the guilt carried into the other world. Nothing but a distinction clearly made between the temporal penalty

(*poena*) and the eternal guilt (*culpa*) would have sufficed, and this distinction was not drawn. A practice of purely Western growth (for such indulgences were) was therefore left existing, but under careful supervision, and the doctrine upon which it was based was left broad enough to protect the practice. Further niceties were put aside and discouraged. The Council avoided condemning some of its supporters who had been unwise, but the views of its critics did not here meet with the anathemas they encountered in other fields of theology. Those who thought the Decree on Purgatory insufficient had right on their side. Another point—the choice of meats—upon which the Reformation at Zürich had begun, and which had been raised in requests to the Council itself, was also now dealt with. All Church observances were recommended to the faithful, especially those tending to mortification (as the choice of meats and fasts) and those tending to piety (as festivals). As the Index was all but ready, and could not now be judged, the work of the Commission was (as already noted) to be laid before the Pope, and by him looked over and published. The same was to be done with the Catechism and the Missal and Breviary. No act of the Council and no assignment of places in it was to create prejudice among ambassadors or ecclesiastics for the future. And lastly, it was decreed that as through the malice of heretics all parts of the faith had been defiled, the Council had therefore made it its chief care to condemn the heresies of the day and deliver the Catholic doctrine. So many bishops could not have been absent from their flocks so long without hurt, and there was no chance that the heretics so oft invited would come

later. Therefore the Council urged all princes to guard its decrees against the heretics and procure their observance; but as difficulties of reception or explanation might arise from its decrees, the Council trusted the Pope would meet these needs by calling to his help assessors, specially from provinces where difficulties have arisen, or by a Council, or some other way.

At the close of the Council all the Decrees from the first were read, and thus the question of its continued existence was settled. The Fathers were then asked if they wished to end the "Sacred Œcumenical Synod" and to ask confirmation from the Pope for all and singular the things decreed. The "Placet"—which the Archbishop of Granada alone refused—was

**Recitation
of all the
Decrees
for
Sessions
I.-XXV.**

possibly as significant as anything done by the Council, and closed for effective purposes a controversy of 200 years upon the relations of Council and Pope. Acclamations after the Oriental model followed, composed and led by the Cardinal of Lorraine—to the memory of the departed and the welfare of the living among the popes, emperors, kings, legates, and prelates concerned in the Council; to the Council, its Faith and its Decrees; to the anathematising of all heretics. All those present, including proctors of absent prelates, then subscribed the proceedings, as they had been enjoined to do under pain of excommunication—four legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, 168 bishops, seven abbots, thirty-nine proctors of absent bishops, and seven generals. But the ambassadors did not sign as wished, for De Luna refused without the leave of his King, and Lorraine's acceptance for France had no force. Roughly speaking, among those present

the Italians were in the later sessions six times as numerous as any other nation. Some bishops, especially German and French, had left, and when the end came there was a sense of relief and gladness. The Pope ordered a thanksgiving, which was celebrated on December 15th. It is no strange thing in a large assembly for contentions to increase and appear insuperable. Then suddenly the mood changes, and in a short space, sometimes with a loss of what is important, all the business is settled amid general agreement and with a sense of relief. It had been so here.

There were some at the Curia who would have been glad to deny or defer the confirmation given. Pope Pius IV. (whose illness had hastened the close, and whose recovery speedily followed it) expressed his genuine approval, and named Cardinals Morone and Simonetti, along with Cardinals Carlo Borromeo, Cicala, and Vitelli, to discuss the means of carrying out the Decrees. Then (by the Bull *Benedictus Deus*, January 26th, 1564) he confirmed the proceedings in Consistory at the request of the legates and cardinals. The printing and circulating of the Decrees was ordered, and all difficulties or questions arising out of them were to be brought to his decision. Bishops were ordered to return to their hungry dioceses. A little later (August 2nd, 1564) a Congregation of the Council of Trent was appointed, composed of eight cardinals, and the work of this congregation has been long and effective. It was reorganised and made permanent under Sixtus V. (1588), but its work was, of course, confined to discipline.

In the sixteenth century it was not as it had been earlier : for a Council to decree was one thing ; for the

Decrees to be enforced was another. It was hardly to be expected that all the States would fall into line. Venice, though not always friendly to Rome, strangely enough led the way, and (although with a reservation in favour of its customs) volunteered obedience. Portugal, with no restriction, and Spain, with a detailed reservation of royal and ecclesiastical privilege, followed (July 2nd, 1564); then Sicily, Flanders, Naples (with reservations of the royal power); Poland (August 7th, 1574) accepted them by the King, although the Diet refused them because the country had not been represented at the Council. The Swiss Catholic Cantons accepted them, and the Emperor did so for his hereditary lands, but not for the Empire. Germany was too much divided. The spiritual Electors did not, as the Emperor, favour the concession of the chalice. This concession, made by the Pope (April 16th, 1564) at the discretion of German bishops, is dealt with elsewhere (Chapter XI.). But (1566) the Elector of Mainz declared, in spite of the Emperor and the Nuncio Commendone, that the Empire could not receive all the Decrees on discipline, although they accepted those on faith and worship. France too did not go so far as the Cardinal (whose influence was now small) had promised. The Decrees were never published there, and some of those on discipline were objected to. The Parliament of Paris gave its reasons in detail: some Decrees were against the rights of the Crown, others against the liberty of the Gallican Church. In 1565, when both Pope and Spain urged consent, it was again refused. The bishops, however, were allowed to carry out in their dioceses all Decrees not against the national laws

Acceptance
of the
Decrees.

or customs, and the Profession of Faith was generally made. Provincial synods at Rheims, Cambrai, Rouen, Tours, Bordeaux, Aix, Bourges, and Toulouse adopted the Decrees in substance. They were thus ecclesiastically binding upon the clergy. Clerical assemblies or their representatives sought to gain the enforcement of the Decrees by the State no less than seven times before 1596, but they were unsuccessful. This difference continued to be a grievance between the King, the Papacy, and the Gallican Church.

The reform of the Breviary, which the Pope had now to carry out, had long been needed. The older Roman office for seculars, dignified and well proportioned, had long been superseded by a more modern office, appearing in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, marked by shorter lessons, often from inferior writers; by such a number of saints' days as to obscure the seasons, and by a freer use of hymns. Under the Avignon Popes, and largely through Franciscan influence, this later Breviary was authorised. It needed simplification: it was overburdened with special offices for festivals, overshadowed by additional offices (the Little Office of Our Lady and the Office of the Dead); its rubrics were incomplete and unsystematic. It was this office that the cathedral chapters so neglected attending, and so often scamped when they did attend. The Council saw the need of reform, but others had seen it before. A higher standard of devotion among the secular clergy ought to be accompanied by a better book of devotion for them to use.

The Humanists had wished for reform of the Breviary, but mainly in the direction of more Ciceronian

Latin and greater elegance. Leo X. gave the task to Ferreri, Bishop of Guardia, who as a beginning of it, published (1525), with the approval of Clement VII., a hymnal, pretty in its conceits, classic in its language and mythology. After Ferreri's death Clement VII. asked Cardinal Quignon (a Spanish Franciscan, General of his Order) to reform the Breviary after ancient models, purging it of prolixities, and making it better for use. The new Breviary appeared (1535), first in a tentative form, criticism of which was welcomed and freely given, and it passed through six editions within two years. The object aimed at now was edification and instruction rather than devotion—objects which are not, of course, inconsistent, but which are best reached by different means. The German Reformers were admittedly stronger than the Catholics in teaching and preaching. This was admitted by Contarini at Regensburg in 1541, although thirty years later the balance shifted. Quignon's Breviary was, on the whole, more Protestant than Catholic in its tendencies of this kind. The strength of the Church lay more in its system than its men, and its system of prayer was what Quignon disregarded. With many devout composers since, he disregarded liturgic tradition. The versicles and responses were left out; and even antiphons (perhaps better spared) did not appear in the first edition. The Psalms were more uniformly distributed, on a plan which was edifying, but not ancient. The Lessons, three in number, were biblical, with the exception of one on saints' days and days with a proper Mass. The changes on saints' days were less marked. Edification was thus the object mainly sought rather than a formal habit of

Ferreri.
Quignon.

devotion. It has been called "a Breviary for busy people," and, in spite of its defects, "a Shortened Service" ensured popularity at the cost of devotion. Paul III. gave leave to many of the secular clergy to use it individually, and the Jesuits found it an easy form to recommend for daily prayer. Canisius, to induce negligent clerks to perform their private duty, gained leave for many to use it. It crept into public use even in some Spanish cathedrals; but the Sorbonne, traditional even where tradition was less excellent than it was here, condemned it. A dislike of it was expressed at Trent. John de Arze, a Spanish theologian, sent in a memoir (August, 1551) in which its faults were shown and a plea made for liturgic tradition. Paul IV. was like-minded, and (August 8th, 1558) stopped further issue of the new Breviary. Thirty years before he had taught his Theatines to seek a reform of the Office (1529), and his ideal, although different from that of Quignon, was earlier than it in date. A revision dealing with the lessons and hymns was made, but not published, and afterwards the Spaniards (November, 1562) asked Pius IV. to take it as a basis of reform. Councils both in France and Germany had also sought for change. Pius therefore asked the Council to appoint a Congregation to consider it. When the Council closed and handed the unfinished task to him, he called Marini, Archbishop of Lanciano, Calinio, Archbishop of Zara, and Foscarari, Bishop of Modena—three of this Congregation—to Rome to complete with the help of others this great work. From the Bull (Pius V.) *Quod a nobis*, which approved the final result, it seems that the Congregation studied MSS. of early Breviaries, struck out what was of foreign origin or of uncertain

authority, but left the essence untouched. In the end the Ferial office was less eclipsed by that for special days, the additional offices were made more occasional, and the Pope went even beyond the rubric in making the use of some of them optional. The regular Psalms were less interfered with, and more of the Bible brought in. When this Breviary came out (July, 1568), that of Quignon was prohibited. Local forms in use for over two hundred years were allowed; and thus Aquileia contrived and Paris struggled to keep their own local use. Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., who thought of an ampler revision (to cover the Missal), and Clement VIII. added some festivals. The last, after seeking the advice of the leading Catholic theologians, asked Baronius to prepare a memoir on the subject. Learning of all kinds was now commoner, but a greater timidity of changes now prevailed, and a Commission suggested by Baronius (1592) made but few and slight changes. Urban VIII. appointed a congregation to purify the text, and a Commission of four Jesuits, with whom he worked himself, to amend the Hymnal (1629); but the result of the latter was not adopted everywhere. The form as left by this Pope has maintained itself since, although, notably in France, wishes have been expressed for further change. The importance of the work thus ended cannot be overstated. Some of the Reformation bodies which had thrown over tradition in forming new models of their own have since felt a need, even a longing, for more liturgic forms. It has been increasingly found that devotion is a matter of habit, and habit a thing that must be formed. The Roman Breviary, once in danger of excessive change, has handed down to less devout

ages the discipline of more prayerful days, and its piety has appealed to pious souls beyond the limits of its own communion.

The revision of the Missal appeared later (1570).

The There had been much variety in local use,
Missal. as well as various texts; but there was less change made here than in the Breviary. It too underwent revision under Clement VIII. (1604) and Urban VIII. (1634).

In nothing more than in Church music had the weakness of the fourteenth century and the frivolity of the Renaissance shown themselves. **Church Music.** The most religious minds, and not even only **Palestrina.** the most severe among them, thought that the music of the day could not be harmonised with religion, and the sternest Catholic reformers (here as elsewhere curiously akin to Puritans) talked of its total disuse. The Emperor Ferdinand, speaking for the Empire, had complained of the singing of the day. And at the same time Lutheranism, more open than Calvinism to the influence of outside helps to religion, was forming its simple congregational music. The Council spoke strongly upon the defects of Church music, and Pius IV. appointed a Commission to consider the question. The musicians then, as often since, regarding the voice as secondary, declared that its distinctness and appropriate accompaniment could not be furnished artistically. But the Commission did not despair: Palestrina, at S. Maria Maggiore, formerly of the Julian Chapel at S. Peter's, but ejected by Paul IV. as a married man, was asked to prepare a Mass at once religious and artistic. His well-known Missa Papae Marcelli prevented a divorce between the Church and music

(1564). His *Improperia*—Passion music—has perhaps gained an even higher praise; and other composers, Italian and Spanish and Belgian, carried on worthily his traditions, and rivalled the Flemish musicians of the fourteenth century. About 1600 Opera began to make Italy its home, and had not Church music been reinforced by the compositions of Palestrina's school, along with the biblical oratorios founded by S. Philip Neri, even worse things might have been in store for it. Happily, the severer type of earlier days, into which life was breathed by the counter-reformation, lived on to show that ecclesiastical tradition and congregational singing could go together. National schools of music have since then given some rich gifts to religion and art alike, but they have been slow to learn the infinite possibilities of art inspired by devotion. It was his vision of these, as shown in his motto, *Domine, illumina oculos meos*, that made Palestrina able to preserve for us the tradition of sacred music.

The extent to which plain instruction had been given parochially in the Middle Ages is often understated. But the frequent inefficiency of the clergy and their neglect of rules had made the provision ineffective. On the other hand, the Catechisms—on a somewhat larger scale, although formed after medieval models—of the Protestant teachers had great effect, and were most efficient means of teaching a plain morality. The Catechism of Canisius is mentioned elsewhere, but the issue of the Roman Catechism, smaller in circulation, although more official, had been handed over by the Council to the Pope. Pius IV. entrusted its preparation to the three prelates already at work upon the Breviary along with Fureiro,

The
Catechism.

a Portuguese theologian. All these, except Calinio, were fellow-Dominicans of the Pope's, and the Catechism—whether a draft laid before the Council was used or not—favoured the Dominican views on Grace where they were opposed to the Jesuits, and thus met with prejudice. Carlo Borromeo and Poggiano revised the Latin original, which was published under Pius V. in September, 1566, and afterwards largely translated. It was intended for the purpose of instruction in accordance with the Decrees, was lucidly and well drawn up, and (1572) was divided into four parts, treating of the Creed, the Sacraments, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer. Its definition of the papal power went perhaps a little beyond the documents of the Council in terming the Pope Universal Pastor and in some of its expressions. The scheme and scope of the work was hardly what the Decree (Session XXIV., Chapter VIII.) seemed to imply, being more for the teacher than the taught; but the translation into vernacular had been expressly ordered. Cardinal Bellarmine also published (1603) another Catechism, used largely by missionaries. The Roman Church was thus meeting its opponents on their own ground of popular instruction with excellent weapons and great results.

Another work the Council had enjoined (Session IV.) was the purification of the Vulgate: the authority

The Vulgate. given to this version, due partly to the existing stage of scholarship and partly to the traditional love of its rhythm, was unfortunate, and played into the hands of the school that opposed Erasmus. After the invention of printing, many individuals had edited the Vulgate; between 1471 and 1599 no less than 179 Latin editions, including

the Complutensian, appeared, some of them translations independent of the Vulgate. There were thus many texts and much uncertainty. Pius IV. created a Congregation of Cardinals and Theologians *pro emendatione Bibliorum*, but its scope was limited to the recovery of the original text of the Vulgate, and its work went on intermittently until 1588. Various editions had appeared (1455–1541). Meanwhile the theologians of Louvain (where an edition had been published in 1547) had been working at a critical edition of wider scope which appeared (1573) at Antwerp, and was reprinted more than once. An edition of the Septuagint, under the patronage of Sixtus V., was printed at Rome (1587), and the Commission which produced it was afterwards set to the Vulgate (1588 onwards): the original Vulgate, the Louvain text, and also deviations from the correct Hebrew and Greek, were considered, and the result has been held better than the Louvain edition itself, which was the best up to that date. But Sixtus V. was dissatisfied with it on the score of its deviation from that edition, the critical defects of which he could not appreciate; he therefore made a new edition (published 1590) himself, with the help of Toletus, a Jesuit, and Rocca, an Augustinian. The introductory Bull (*Aeternus ille*) prescribed this edition as the true, legitimate, authentic, and undoubted exemplar, to be used solely in public and private, and not to be superseded. The work and the correcting of the proofs was a great enjoyment to him, but his scholarship was not equal to the task, and great controversy upon papal power and infallibility has since then raged around it. The Congregation *de emendatione* complained (1591) to Gregory XIV. of the disregard shown to their work

and of the defects in the Sixtine edition, a prohibition of which was recommended by some of them. Bellarmine tells us that he on the other hand recommended a buying up of the copies and the issue of a new edition, under the name of Sixtus, with the correction of the numerous mistakes as if mere printer's errors, and not due to Sixtus himself; the course he commended, with his reasons for it, was more creditable to his regard for the Papacy than to his candour or accuracy. A new Commission (February, 1591) was appointed, and the result of their work after a supervision appeared under Clement VIII. (1592), but it too contains many misprints. The intention of the Council in this matter has been sometimes misrepresented: an authorised version was to be prepared, which was to be both accurate and official, but the discouragement afterwards shown to critical labour lay not with the decree itself, but with a feeling and policy independent of it, and gradually gathering strength. But this feeling, akin to that which had opposed Erasmus, was not shared by the Jesuits of the sixteenth century. It should be noted that while the list of Canonical Books (Session IV.) is made a matter of faith and confirmed by anathema, the chapter on the use and interpretation of the books has no anathema attached, although a breach of the restraints upon printers might make offenders liable to anathema or fine.

Decrees had ordered (XXIV., 12, and XXV., 2) that all bishops and holders of benefice should make a public profession of faith according to the doctrine of the Council. Such a profession was now (1564) drawn up for the Pope, to whom its preparation had been

left, by a commission of cardinals. It consisted of twelve Articles, the Nicene Creed being the first, and the eleventh a reception of all things decreed by General Councils, including Trent. The intervening articles assert apostolic and ecclesiastic traditions and all the observances and constitutions of the Roman Church; that the Scriptures are to be taken in the Church's sense and interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Fathers; the seven sacraments, with the ceremonies attached; the Decrees on Original Sin and Justification; the Mass as a sacrifice; transubstantiation; invocation of saints; images and indulgences; the Roman Church, as the mother and mistress of all churches, with an oath of obedience to the Pope. The twelfth article affirms the impossibility of salvation without this Catholic faith, and ends with a personal promise to retain it and to do the utmost that it shall be held and taught by all under the person making the profession. The Bulls *Injunctum nobis* (November 13th, 1564) and *In sacrosancti beati Petri* (December 2nd, 1564) made this form binding upon all priests and teachers in seminaries and colleges. It also came to be widely used for converts, although other differing forms have been used for that purpose. This profession brought home to individuals that definiteness and closing up around Rome and the Papacy which had marked the Council. There was no longer any vagueness as to faith or any looseness of organisation. The doubtful questions of Scholasticism were thus closed, at any rate superficially, and the power of the Papacy, which was essentially a medieval growth, was asserted in a form both popular and clear. The attitude of the

Profession
of the
Tridentine
Faith.
"Creed of
Pope Pius."

Council towards the Middle Ages was marked: it summed up and emphasised their results.

So much has been said already of the gain in organisation and discipline due to the Council that no more need be added. But it was significant that important details affecting both worship and life had been left to the Pope for settlement. This was the upshot of the continued, but practically settled strife between Pope and Council. Nothing had been done to make easier the return of the Protestant dissentients to the Church. Nothing could well have been done. A generation bred in Lutheranism had by this time arisen, and the Calvinists cared little to seek a unity which went against their theory of an invisible Church. But when the Council condemned much that was unreal and evil in the life of the Church and it gradually disappeared, some of their ground for dissatisfaction had been cut away from the Protestants. High ideals of life and sound morality were henceforth characteristics, as they ought always to have been, of the clerical life in the Church. One concession, showy but not really important, had been made—the concession of the chalice. But even this had been made by the Pope more than by the Council, and in regard to worship the Papacy had shown itself, notably in the case of the Breviary, more open to change than the majority of the higher clerics. It was more significant that the Curia and the College of Cardinals remained, in spite of a continued outcry, almost unreformed. The exhortations of the Council to the Pope in this matter had been vague. They were either disregarded or scarcely carried out. Even here, however, higher ideals of duty had their effect, and the

improvement, carried out by various popes, was gradual but firm. The Curia and the College of Cardinals had gained a power not strictly based upon anything written, but yet a power without which or against which any pope would find it hard to hold his own. The power of the Pope had been greatly strengthened; the view that Bishops were his delegates had been partly assumed, partly expressed: with the organisation now set up it was easy to develop this view still further. The Bishops thus lost much of their old independence. It was now easy to control the Roman Church, but it was harder to keep its hold upon the vigorous life of nations. But another power, equally undefined, but based upon real importance and great achievement, had now appeared—that of the Jesuits. And this Society had left the Council with a reputation enhanced and with new paths of activity plainly marked. It had seemed that Rome had lost its power upon the Western World. The Council made it clear how far or how little that was the case. Politically and religiously—even more so where the two spheres met—Rome was now far more powerful than before. The Council of the Lateran and that of Trent stood far apart in their importance and their results. The one compared with the other left the Papacy in a different state and with a very different forecast for the future.

CHAPTER X

MONASTIC REFORM AND THE JESUITS

THE beginning of the sixteenth century saw not only a widespread wish for reform, but an attempt to bring it about. This attempt, based upon the revival of both classical and patristic learning, and upon the study of doctrinal theology, was most successful in Spain, where it gained control of the whole Church. Here the strictest orthodoxy was found joined to a renewed study of Aquinas and a high ideal of clerical life. Like conditions existed elsewhere, and, although apparently less successful in controlling national life or clerical discipline, were as significant for the future of the Church.

In Italy the Monastic Orders and the Friars felt the new impulses; the Benedictines (as already mentioned) were reorganised (1504). Among the Camol-
Medieval Reform.
Monastic Revival. dolites—the hermit Order to which Peter Damiani had belonged—a separate and stricter congregation arose (1523), under the leadership of Paul Giustiniani, a zealous Venetian. Among the Franciscans Matteo de Bassi tried to restore the life and spirit of their founder, thus repeating the attempts of the strict observants which divided the Order and disturbed the Church politics of the Middle

Ages. This old strife between Conventuals (who dwelt together) and Observants had been ended by Leo. X. (1517); his allowance to each party of its own General led to peace. Even among the Observants, however, there were varying degrees of strictness; a quarrel with them drove Bassi to attach his followers to the Conventuals, but as a separate congregation. By leave of Clement VII., he organised them with the special view of preaching to, and working among, the poor, whom they largely drew to themselves, and whose lives they influenced widely. These Capuchins, so called from their pointed hoods, were deservedly popular long before they were made (1619) an independent Order; the check they suffered when their Vicar-General, Bernardino Ochino, fell into heresy (1542) was only temporary, and they have done much for religion in poor and common life. Akin to the poor in their sympathies, they were also often like them in their prejudices and superstitions. In Milan, the Barnabites were organised for mission and parochial work by Antony Maria Zaccaria (1530). Placed to begin with under the Archbishop of Milan, they were afterwards placed directly under the Pope. It was among this Order S. Carlo Borromeo—Archbishop of Milan—not only chose his confessor, but made his retreats. Thus, in Italy, at its worst, the religious life was upheld, and the licence of the upper classes was balanced by the increased devotion of the lower. Of like movements in Germany enough has been said already (pages 8–9).

The Capuchins, 1528.

But among the higher and more cultured classes also the same religious impulse was felt. Some fifty priests of high position at Rome, cherishing a high

ideal of life, founded an informal society—the Oratory of Divine Love. Sadoleti, Giberti, Caraffa, with others, whose later paths diverged most widely, were members of it; many others, like Contarini, were in such close sympathy with them as to be reputed members; nor was Rome their only centre, for their influence reached to Vicenza, Verona, and Venice. But this purely personal and semi-academic movement took a more practical turn when (1524) Count Gaetano di Tiene, aided by his abler friend Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV.), Bishop of Chieti (Theate), founded the Order of Theatines. The special object of this strict society was to train parish priests, but a secondary aim was the suppression of heresy. Many of its members were noble, marked both by birth and talents for the high office they reached, and the Order thus gained an influence in Italy beyond what its mere numbers warranted.

Among female Orders, the Ursulines, founded (1535) at Brescia, by Angela di Merici, for the reclaiming of the fallen, soon turned to the education of girls, and after their formation (1544) into an Order, spread widely and did well in their special work. But Spain, as was natural, gave to the world the most noted type of monastic female. S. Teresa was both an example of mysticism, more medieval than modern, and a leader of monastic reform. She was herself a Carmelite, and founded (1562) a new Order of bare-footed Carmelites, which, owing to her mysticism, met with opposition. Medieval mysticism had, on the one hand, touched theological study and the devotional spirit; on the other hand, it touched not only heresy and contempt

for means of grace, but even licence of life. S. Teresa's visionary mysticism was of the most spiritual and devoted type; but, nevertheless, it brought her under the suspicion of the Inquisition, always on the watch for peculiar forms of energy overflowing established limits, and in this case incited to action by her own older Order. But both by her life and her teaching she showed how the union with God—the basis of her mysticism—could be realised, so as to be a light to the world.

Of great importance and of interest was the life of S. Philip de Neri. This young Florentine on leaving college devoted himself to the service of the sick in Roman hospitals; in 1548 he founded the confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity, and soon built a large hospital for pilgrims. But the Oratory in which lectures in divinity were given to these pilgrims became so crowded that a church was given for their use (1558). In 1574 the congregation of the Oratory, as it was called—composed of both priests and laymen, bound by common aims but by no vows—was authorised. The later history of the society—some of its members like Baronius, its second general, and author of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* (†1607), famed for learning, and some like the founder, for pre-eminent piety—was worthy of its conception. A French society, the Oratory of Jesus, founded by Cardinal Bérulle (1611), quickly spreading and including many learned members, gave rise in its turn to similar movements.

**S. Philip
de Neri,
1513-95.
Cardinal
Bérulle,
1611.**

Nor did Cardinal Bérulle stand alone, for the French Benedictines, fallen from their old estate, now

underwent a great revival. Didier de la Cour, placed when young (1596) as Prior over the Abbey of S. Vannes, at Verdun, prepared himself by a long course of study for his work, and then roused his brethren to sacred study, joined to a strict observance of their rule. The movement spread, and (1618) all the reformed monasteries joined to form the congregation of S. Maur, which grew to the number of 180 houses. No revival ever bore better fruit in learned men, especially in patristics and ecclesiastical history. To it we owe Mabillon, Martène, Durand, D'Achery, and many others.

In spiritual matters and in ecclesiastical politics, no one was a greater figure than Carlo Borromeo; this saintly prelate and cardinal, a nephew of Pius IV. and a director of the papal counsels, was led by the laxity of clerical life to strive for a higher ideal. Not even his rapid promotion—he became Cardinal and Archbishop of Milan when twenty-two—could spoil his character or bring him enemies. Nor did he lose the statesman in the saint, for his government of the states of the Church committed to his charge was model. His influence spread far beyond the limits of his diocese, where the revival of Church life was complete, although the Oblates, founded (1528) by him at Milan, did not extend as far as many other orders. Whether owing to his experience of politics, or to his natural disposition, he was noted then, and has been rightly condemned in later days, for his undue severity and intolerance against Protestants. Even so far north as Switzerland, he furthered the Counter-Reformation;

his Swiss college at Milan, his introduction into Switzerland of the Jesuits (1574-81), and of the Capuchins (1581-8), and his foundation of a permanent nunciature at Luzern, had consolidated the Catholics of the country, and the Borromean League (1586) of Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Soluthurn, Freiburg, and Zug, for the defence of the Catholic Church, kept his name alive. His saintly life and unwearied diligence gave an example, fruitful both at Rome and Milan.

Many of these orders or congregations (for the looser form was often preferred) differed from medieval types in being practical rather than contemplative; the individual search after perfection, the brotherhood of the common life, did not inspire them so much as did

**Features
of these
Move-
ments.**

a wish to check the evils of clerical life and raise the priesthood. Nor were the motives of working among the poor or suffering and among unbelievers wanting; and thus the spirit of S. Francis was reproduced. Gradually, too, as the century went on, France, whose disturbed religious politics caused and upset so many nice calculations, took the place of Spain and Italy at the birthplace of these movements. The impulses which caused them were widely spread, and spiritual links between them were common. Thus S. Vincent de Paul had joined the Oratory of Cardinal Bérulle before he founded his own society; S. Francis de Sales was influenced by his Jesuit director, Possevin. In an atmosphere favourable to their growth these orders arose and gave rise to others. No age, indeed, is richer in special types of saintliness than the one we are dealing with. The variety of practical objects aimed at is also worthy of note. Education stood foremost

with the Piarists or Brethren of the Pious Schools, founded (1600) by Joseph Calasanze, a Spanish priest in Italy. They were recognised as an order (1621), and became only second to the Jesuits in their influence upon schools. Other minor orders had the same end in view. The care of the sick was the aim of the Brothers of Charity (Brethren of S. John of God), founded at Seville (1540) by a Portuguese monk, John of God. It should also be noted how the spirit of association was spreading from the regular to the secular clergy, who composed wholly or partly many of these bodies.

Many of these activities were combined in the rich and saintly career of S. Vincent de Paul. A Gascon, **S. Vincent de Paul**, born at Pouy, near Dax, by the Pyrenees, the son of poor parents and himself a shepherd, he studied under the Franciscans near Rome, and then at the University of Toulouse. After his ordination as priest (1600), he spent some years in teaching and in study, until his capture by Barbary pirates placed him as a slave at Tunis. His last master, a renegade Christian, was led by pity and remorse to give him freedom, and together they returned to Christendom. After a visit to Rome, S. Vincent went on a mission to France, where he joined the Oratory of Cardinal Bérulle. In obedience to commands laid upon him, he first took parish work, and then a tutorship in the family of the Count de Joigny. His experience of country places and their needs led him to the idea of Missions for their good (1617), which took shape in the College des Bons Enfants for that purpose. He also became Chaplain-General to the galley-slaves, over whom the Count de

Joigny was General, and in this sad field his work was intense. But the needs of the clergy and of parochial life were still before him, and (1632) he founded the Priory of S. Lazare for the Society of the Mission. These Missioners, besides their natural work, largely took charge of the seminaries so widely set up after the Council of Trent. Before long, Missions in Italy, Switzerland, Poland, Ireland, and even Madagascar witnessed to the need S. Vincent had seen. When a bishop complained to him of the number of drunken or immoral priests in his diocese, S. Vincent resolved to deepen the sense of Vocation in candidates for the priesthood; Ordination Retreats (Lent, 1631) were the result. Then from the conferences held to carry on the work so begun sprang a confraternity with the same objects, of which Bossuet was an early member. While in parish work (1617), he had felt the urgency of cases needing help, and seen the great waste in relieving them: this led him to organise the Confraternity of Charity composed at first of wealthy ladies. But he with many later reformers soon saw that charity must be organised permanently, and not left to amateur administrators; thus he was led to found the Sisters of Charity. This led on naturally to the training of nurses; that, again, to help in hospitals and the care of homeless infants. The foundation of the hospital of the Name of Jesus (as an almshouse), and then of the Saltpetrière (for the same end, but on a larger scale) were merely incidents in a life crowded with good works. From his death-bed (1660), he could look back upon a number of varied works, any one of which could save an ordinary name from oblivion. The special note of his life beyond his saintliness is

the ready provision of means for coping with evils met in his daily life; so little by little he was led on from one great deed to another. His master's motto, *Coepit facere et docere* ("He began to do and to teach"), was true of himself; he was always beginning some new form of doing, some new form of teaching; and his life completed is the best of lessons.

Yet another type of saint was shown in S. Francis de Sales. The eldest son of a noble family of Annecy in Savoy, he felt his vocation from childhood; when only eleven he took the tonsure, but his father meant him for the career of law, and with that in view he was educated at Paris. In 1593, much against his father's will, he was made Provost or Dean of Geneva, and ordained priest. His great wish was to carry always with him the atmosphere of the altar; thus his care for souls as Confessor, and his heart-felt sermons with practical lessons, had a force beyond themselves, and he showed that better side of mysticism which had been so strong in Spain not long before. He was sent (1594) to carry on a mission in Chablais, a district just gained by Catholic Savoy from Protestant Bern, and here his devotion succeeded beyond all hope; he soon became Coadjutor-Bishop of Geneva, to which see he finally succeeded. His claim to remembrance lies not only in his foundation of a female order—the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin—or in his spiritual writings—as the *Introduction to the Devout Life*—but also in his model episcopate, a pattern and a wonder far and wide; his private piety and his public work were blended into one almost perfect flower.

It is a tribute to the importance of the Jesuits that

their rise should have obscured that of these other societies, energetic and useful as they were. **The Jesuits.** The personality of the founder, with his background of Spanish chivalry and crusading zeal; the skill of his organisation perfected by succeeding generals; their success in the work undertaken, partly through their definiteness of aim, partly through the opportune moment of their appearing—all these factors gave them importance. But the personality of Ignatius Loyola should not make us forget the history of Spain that made his career possible; the success of the Jesuits should not lead us to forget that other societies with similar aims and success only inferior to theirs had also arisen. It is an error to regard the appearance of either these other orders or of the Jesuits as due to a mere reaction against Protestantism; their appearance takes its proper place as one event in a long series beginning with the earliest movements for reform and a more vigorous life, strengthened by the religious side of the Renaissance, and finally issuing in the reforms of Trent. It sounds paradoxical to say that Protestantism and Jesuitism should have arisen partly from the same causes, but so far as each was due to a positive wish for reform and an impatience of evils such was the case. The causes that made the one a support to the Church and the other an attack upon it are not far to seek; they lie partly in the leaders of the movements, partly in the way in which they were met, and partly in the political atmosphere that surrounded them.

Ignacio Lopez de Recalde was born at the château of Loyola in Guipúzcoa (1491); as a younger son he was

brought up to arms, and began his career as a royal page. When in command of Pampeluna Ignatius Loyola, (1521) he was forced to surrender to the French, and being wounded was sent home to recover. During his long illness he turned from the tales of chivalry he knew to books of devotion, the Flowers of the Saints and others; Spain was the land of chivalry and mystic devotion alike, and he shared the national sympathies. When he left home, healed but lame for life, the energy of his knighthood was turned into new channels; he went (1522) to Montserrat, which the late Abbot Dom Garcia de Cisneros, a nephew of Cardinal Ximenes and the author of the devotional *Exercitatorium Spirituale*, had made a centre of influence; thence he passed to Manresa, a resting-place for pilgrims to Montserrat, and the traditional scene of the conception of the Society. His sojourn there, where visions and meditations gave a tinge of mysticism to his zeal, was a crisis in his life. After a vigil much like that of a knight he meant to journey to Jerusalem to convert the heathen; he accomplished the voyage, but on arrival found he could do but little: his lack of knowledge and his powerlessness when alone was borne in upon him; he returned to equip himself for his venture and to seek for companionship. Years not only of study but of teaching and preaching also at Barcelona, Alcala, and Salamanca taught him his powers and his methods of work; in each place he gathered followers around him; both at Salamanca and at Alcala he fell under the suspicion of the Holy Office as a mystic—a charge based on truth—and spent some weeks in prison. He was bidden to study theology for four years before he could

preach and teach, and he betook himself (February, 1528) to Paris with the idea of his brotherhood already in his mind; he had a singular power, not only of arousing enthusiasm in others (which is easy), but of dominating their whole thought and life, and here he gathered his first real band of disciples, Pierre le Fèvre, a Savoyard, Francis Xavier and Iago Lainez, both Spaniards, and others. On August 15th, 1534, the little company, seven in number, together took oaths of celibacy, poverty, and a spiritual crusade in Syria. If this last could not be carried out they were to place themselves at the disposal of the Pope for employment where and how he pleased. It was this last condition that in the end marked out for the Jesuits their great task and their stupendous future.

Venice was to be their starting-point for the East; here the comrades met (1537), and here Ignatius came into touch with Caraffa and the Theatines, whose objects and methods must have im-pressed him; here, too, after an interview held by some of them with Pope Paul III. at Rome, those not already priests received ordination. At length giving up their Eastern voyage, they betook themselves singly to Rome, each on the way thinking over the organisation they should adopt. Ignatius himself gave them besides the main idea their name, "the Company of Jesus," "like a cohort or century gathered to fight spiritual enemies, as men devoted body and soul to our Lord Jesus Christ and his Vicar on Earth." On reaching Rome they set to work; as at Venice, so here they preached, and did it with success. Paul III. employed them for teaching and preaching in his schools and colleges. Papal and popular favour drew jealousy upon

**The Order,
1534-40.**

them, and to place themselves in safety Ignatius gained recognition (1538) from the Pope. Gradually their organisation took shape; their General was to have unlimited power, and to hold office for life; he was to be venerated as if Christ were present in him. The whole life and strength of every member was to be given in warfare for Christ and the Pope, carrying out at once and without reserve all the Pope should order in any place or land, among heretics or heathen. This was the constitution approved by the Pope and was the very thing that was needed; Protestantism had attacked the Papacy which to the closing Middle Ages stood for Western unity; hence the Jesuits had come to its support. Ignatius had only slowly realised what his order could do, but gradually the problem of the reconquest of the Protestant West instead of the heathen East had shaped itself before him; the difficulty of a new problem gave to his order, as it had formerly done to the Franciscans, an impulse to overcome it. "The finger of God is here," said Pope Paul. When the three Cardinals appointed to examine the new order and its constitution were ready to report unfavourably the Pope himself (like Contarini favourable to them) gained their approval for it. The new society was sanctioned (September 27th, 1540) on condition its members should never exceed sixty in number, a condition afterwards removed (1543). As preachers, directors of consciences and teachers of the young, the company was to serve the Church; and to further their work many privileges were afterwards given them.

If obedience to the Papacy was the most striking feature of the society to begin with, the absolute

power given to the General was to be of the greatest moment later on. In the original constitution as approved by Paul III., the advice of the Council was a slight check upon the General, but before many years this was done away with (1550); the General, sole disposer of the destinies of the members, stood alone. Ignatius himself was naturally the first General (April 5th, 1541). Before his death (July 31st, 1556) his order was firmly rooted and full-grown; he himself had at any rate in the main devised the lines of its constitution, although it was only under Lainez—the next General—that it was definitely settled in details: the differences from older foundations were probably not favourably regarded by the Curia, and only gradually gained approval. Julius III. (1550–5) was most friendly to them; under him and by his liberal help the Roman College, a teaching body of great ability and much influence, afterwards moved to the Gesù, and the German College (1552), for the special training of German youths, were begun. Marcellus II. was even more friendly still, and had he lived longer the order would probably have gained that supreme power its critics seemed to fear. His early death brought to the papal throne (1555), Cardinal Caraffa (Paul IV.), who distrusted the order both as too Spanish and as sufficiently akin to his Theatines in object to make their separate existence unreasonable. There followed the first of the many struggles between Pope and Jesuits, complicated by internal strife between Lainez, the acting Vicar, and some of the members. The Pope wished to make the regular recitation of offices in choir compulsory for the society,

**Peculiarities
of the
Society.**

which would have forced it into resemblance to other orders and made their peculiar work more difficult; he also wished to limit the General's term of office to three years, which would have seriously weakened his position. The next Pope, Pius IV. (1559), removed these restrictions, which the society had never heartily adopted.

The constitutions of the society had not been formed hastily; its ideas were the mingled result of its the meditations and long experiences of **Constitution.** S. Ignatius himself. The years of waiting and the changes of scene had borne their **Its Growth.** fruit, and as the exact nature of his task **The Exercises.** opened itself out before him he adapted most skilfully the means to the end; in the last stage at Rome itself something must have been due to Lainez, the second General, from whom S. Ignatius differed greatly in character. The latter was above all things an enthusiast with a spiritual power (enhanced by patience) of drawing men and keeping them close to himself. The former was a cool scholar and statesman, a theologian of power and a politician of skill. To him the political, as distinct from the religious, importance of the society is due. Both under Loyola and Lainez there had been opposition, from inside as well as from outside, to the hardening absolutism of the system. The latter while acting General (August, 1556—July, 1558) had to face the charge of delaying in his own interests the publication of the constitution. Thus the outside policy and outside success of the society must be ascribed to Lainez, while to S. Ignatius himself was due the internal preparation that made that success possible. The *Spiritual Exer-*

cises of Manresa, next to the *Imitatio Christi*, the most powerful work of its class, unlike the *Imitatio*, not the outpouring of a soul but a spiritual guide for others, is the basis of the internal preparation. It is mystic and spiritual, but it never loses sight of the active work with the need of strength for its accomplishment; it is thoroughly practical and common-sense in its wise and full treatment of detail. The passages upon bodily discipline and postures in devotions, for instance, give apt illustration of these features. In the book, as in the society itself (to begin with, at any rate) it is hard to divide fairly our admiration between the exalted spirit raised above the world and the perfect knowledge of the world with the adaptation of everything to it. Self-sacrifice and wisdom, ardour and calculation are not easy to combine; but in this book as in the society they are blended with the utmost skill. The man who passes through the four weeks or divisions into which the exercises are divided has (1) got rid of his evil self and also of his personality so far as it is a hindrance to his great aim; (2) he has taken Christ's life as the model of his own; (3) he has realised Christ's sufferings for him as his own; and (4) he has entered into the triumph and the joy of Christ; while self-surrender, docility, and obedience of all the faculties in subordination to one great end have been learnt in the process. The spirit and method of the Exercises are the spirit and method of the society.

According to the Constitution, *novices* were to spend two years in study and the Exercises, under the constant watch of their superiors, who thus came to know their natures and capabilities. At the end of the novitiate they took the vows of poverty, chastity,

and obedience, along with a promise to remain in the society and do the work appointed by the General. The next stage was that of the *scholastic*, spent in the study of arts for five years, followed by a term of some years' teaching. An *approved scholastic* might, after a four years' course of theology (in which he also studied the Exercises for himself) and a second novitiate of a year, receive priesthood and become a *Spiritual Coadjutor*. In its ample provision of education, training in obedience, and humble work, as well as in the higher business of life and knowledge of men, the scheme was very complete. In practice it is elastic enough to develop the talents of the individual, while the oversight of superiors and the personal sense of vocation are never relaxed. If not ordained the *scholastic* might become a *Temporal Coadjutor*, engaged in the secular business of the society much as lay-brethren in other orders. Beyond the *Spiritual Coadjutors* were the *Professed* with their three ordinary vows, and also a fourth of special obedience to the Pope to go wherever he might send. These *Professed* made up but a small part of the society; at the time of the death of S. Ignatius they numbered only thirty-five out of a total of a thousand. From among the *Spiritual Coadjutors* and the *Professed* were chosen, by the General, the officers of the colleges and the Provincials. All these held office for three years only, while the General, elected by the congregation, held his for life. All these officers sent to the General yearly reports, and thus the centralisation of knowledge as of power was complete. By the side of the General stood a Council of six assistants

elected by the congregation from the assistancies of Germany, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Poland. It might seem as if there was here an absolute tyranny, the guidance of a single mind. But even over the General there was a watchful guard, and he, as other members, had become part of the great tradition and the system it involved. There was no risk of a General working too much upon an individual line, while yet all the advantages of his individual energy and wisdom were made use of. In the same way the advantages of other orders were combined with the utmost liberty in such points as dress, and the relaxation of rules when desirable for important ends. The regulation by which no Jesuit could without leave accept any bishopric or high office in the Church ensured to the society the constant help of its most gifted members and put a check upon merely personal ambitions.

In Italy, as was natural, the society spread rapidly; it appealed specially to the cultured classes, and its influence among the small princely families soon made itself felt. Venice, where they founded a college (1542), became a Jesuit centre, and even in its time of political decay, its importance as a literary and intellectual centre was great. Faenza and Bologna were also Jesuit strongholds. The school at Messina, where the studies followed Parisian models, became the type of the excellent schools set up by the society. In other countries also the society gained power. Spain, where the Emperor Charles V. had a reasonable distrust of papal policy, and where the Dominicans disliked Jesuit intrusion, was slow to

**Spread
of the
Society
in Italy.**

Spain.

receive them, until Francis Borgia, great-grandson of Alexander VI., Duke of Gandia and Viceroy of Catalonia, became their patron, and after at length (1548) joining them, rose to be General (1565-72). Although the Archbishop of Toledo refused to allow his clergy to have any intercourse with them, and they were excommunicated at Saragossa, Borgia's influence turned the scale in their favour. To begin with, they gained influence among the lower classes, while later on they pushed their way into the Universities, first at Gandia (under Borgia) and then at Alcala and Salamanca, at which last place they had a college of their own. In the Netherlands they gained a footing (1556 onwards) under Philip II. and the Viceroy Margaret of Parma, and in 1584 the restrictions there which had so long vexed them were removed. Their college at Louvain intensified and carried on the Catholic traditions of the University. Portugal welcomed them more warmly than Spain had done. Thence S. Francis Xavier sailed for the Indies, but not before he had begun a work destined to give them the complete control of Royal Family and kingdom.

In France the Chancellor du Prat, and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, introduced them; but the Sorbonne, the theological faculty of the University of Paris, and the Parliament of Paris, that legal body which had grown into a national power, opposed them. The latter, indeed, declared them enemies of Church and State, and the former condemned them as disturbers of the Church's peace and overthrowers of monastic orders. Many bishops led by Eustace du Bellay, of Paris, shut them out of

their dioceses, and the parish clergy followed their official leaders. Only when the Civil Wars of Religion were ready to break out did the bishops consent to receive them (1561), and even then they stipulated for their subordination to themselves. It was Lainez who, while in France for the Conference at Poissy (September, 1561), procured their admission. The College of Clermont, then founded, soon gained distinction, but the society has nowhere undergone more vicissitudes than in France. Germany, owing to the spread of Lutheranism, had been marked out by Loyola as a field for the society. Le Fevre, Le Jay, and Bobadilla were the first workers there; the first soon passed into Spain. Bobadilla, who incurred the Emperor's anger by his opposition to the Interim, took Bavaria for his sphere: Albert V., brother-in-law of Ferdinand, founded a college for them at Ingolstadt (1549), and another at Munich (1559). Le Jay, in Austria, gained the ear of Ferdinand, and after he had been joined (1551) by others Vienna became one of their strongest settlements. Peter Canisius, who succeeded Le Jay as Rector there, was a leading theologian of the day. As a young man he had shared in opposing the attempt of Hermann von Wied, the reforming Bishop of Köln, to Protestantise his see (1542-7); as Rector at Ingolstadt he had carried on the learned and reforming traditions of John Maier, of Eck. When only thirty-two years old he was called to Vienna, there to become Rector of the Jesuit foundation, and to found a seminary for priests. Two professorships in the University were allotted to the society; and here, as at

In
Germany.

Canisius,
1520-98.

Prague, Freiburg in Breisgau, Trier, Mainz, Salzburg, Bamberg, and Constanzt, their system of education produced great results. It would be difficult to localise the activity of Canisius, who travelled widely from Switzerland to Poland, working both upon the Universities and the general public. His *Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ* (or larger Catechism) was the theological text-book of the Catholic revival; his small (1556) and smaller (1559) Catechisms provided for Catholics means of teaching, in which for some thirty years they had been excelled by Protestants; five hundred editions and many translations are sufficient proofs of its success. His activity was rewarded by his becoming Provincial (1556) of the newly erected Province of Upper or Southern Germany, including the Habsburg territories, Bavaria, Suabia, and Switzerland. But the Province of Lower Germany remained comparatively unworked.

The activity of the society in England during our period falls into two divisions, in the earlier of which, under Elizabeth and James I., its members devoted themselves rather to private administrations not different in kind from those of other priests, and in the latter of which they were more concerned with diplomacy and attempts at influencing people of importance. In the former period arose between the Jesuits and the secular priests, both of them in captivity at Wisbech, the struggle known as the Arch-priest Controversy. This sprang from the attempt of the Jesuits to rule by an "Arch-priest" over both the regulars and seculars; the strife led to great bitterness, and tended to place the Catholics who kept to the Papal obedience still

further outside the main currents of national life. But however unfortunate the political results of their activity, in England as elsewhere the Jesuits gave proof of the greatest persistency and devotion, and in spite of their connection with politics some of their members truly earned the rank of martyr. In the second period of their activity, although their influence was, like their diplomacy, rated too highly at the time, their field of work was more the Court than the country at large, and even here they were overshadowed by members of other orders, esteemed more suited to the special task. In some other countries, such as Poland, the whole progress of the Counter Reformation was due to the work of Jesuits.

CHAPTER XI

GERMANY : 1555-1648

FOR nearly seventy years (1555-1618) the history of Germany was dominated by the religious question. The peace had merely been a truce, and it had, as stated before, weaknesses of its own. The Catholics and the Lutherans accepted it so far as it suited their own ends, and so far only : each party protested against the benefits enjoyed by the other, and the Calvinists standing outside the peace could only enter it by the door of the Augsburg Confession. Of the two most essential parts the Ecclesiastical Reservation and the Declaration of Toleration, the one had not full effect, and the latter depended merely upon the Emperor's word. Meanwhile the Imperial power grew weaker, the Habsburg house became more purely Austrian in its aims, and the central power was ineffective : local princes overshadowed it alike in their religious policies and their foreign alliances. The Empire, as a whole, had no policy of its own. Thus in the absence of political progress the interest of German history lies mainly in religious matters : the influence of Papal Nuncios, the progress of the Counter Reformation, the early revival of the Augustinian Friars and the later growth of Jesuit influence, the reform and organisation begun at

Trent: these were the chief features on the Catholic side. On the Protestant side there were: the attacks upon the *Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*, the attempts at union and the growth of discord between Lutherans and Calvinists, and the constant secularising of Church estates. Meanwhile political danger from France coquetting with the Protestant princes, dynastic dangers from Spain, and the existence of religious wars on the frontiers in France and the Netherlands, with the constant pressure of the Turks on the east, threw the Emperor upon the princes for help, and made him realise increasingly the disastrous effects of religious discontent. Hence the Emperor Ferdinand had a distinct policy of his own for internal affairs, not quite consistent with either his strong Catholicism or his religious policy in his hereditary lands. His German instincts and his Catholic principles combined, and the resultant expressed the political needs of the nation. When (March 14th, 1588) he was crowned Emperor, the maintenance of the Religious Peace was included in his Election Covenant; the defiant policy of Paul IV. towards him endangered his relations with the Church, but politically the mediating (or to the Protestant view, the timid) policy of Electoral Saxony under Augustus (1553-86), working with the Catholic Electors of Mainz and Trier, secured his position.

**Policy of
Ferdin-
and I.**

Not only in politics, but in religion there might have grown up a mediating or combined party, satisfying the Protestant demand for reform (so far as that demand was genuine) by small changes and concessions as well as by liberality and piety of spirit, yet not departing from

**The
mediating
party.**

Catholic lines. On the Catholic side, Julius von Pflug (who had been elected Bishop of Naumburg in 1541, but opposed by Amsdorf, the candidate supported by the Elector and consecrated by Luther) is a fair example; he was ready, as was also Gropper, to adopt large and inclusive definitions on the Mass and Justification, and to concede clerical marriage and the chalice; there were not wanting like-minded men on the Protestant side. Even the Lutheran services in some places resembled those of the Catholics: a Breviary used by them at Halberstadt up to 1801 might well have belonged to the Catholics. But such cases were exceptional. Such a party would not have satisfied the Papacy (for they were scarcely Papalists), the orthodox Spaniards, or the majority of Protestants, and before the third assembly at Trent, at any rate, the end they hoped for had become impossible. But before that the dividing lines between Catholics and Protestants, either in thought or in practice, were not drawn so rigidly or clearly as since and elsewhere: had the policy of the Papacy and of the princes been different, had politics not given Protestantism a vitality it did not possess of itself, had not the Counter Reformation closed up the ranks of Catholicism and given it a more rigid test for discrimination, above all, had not controversy hardened into hatred, Germany might have been united instead of divided. As it was, ecclesiastical politics tended more and more to war. The wonder was not that the Thirty Years' War came when it did (1618-48), but that its coming was so long delayed.

The division between Calvinists or Reformed (as

they came to be called after the *Formula of Concord*, 1577), and Lutherans grew. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse, more Zwinglian than Lutheran, but more a politician than either, would have gladly united the two parties; the Swiss Protestants were united nearly by the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549), and fully by the Second Helvetic Confession (1566). But in Germany division grew, the strength of Melanchthon (which some thought weakness) was thrown on the side of peace, and an extremist party headed by Flacius Illyricus was formed against him. Some of the Protestants wished to combine against the *Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*, but theological differences outweighed even the love of gain: a colloquy (one among many) at Worms (1557) failed to bring about peace. Duke John Frederick of (Ernestine) Saxony had taken a strong line, and made the University of Jena a stronghold against the Crypto-Calvinists (as Melanchthon and his followers were often called). Flacius was called thither that same year, and ruled the religion of Ducal Saxony. The Electoral (Albertine) line under Augustus (always afraid of a restoration of the other line to its rights) took the opposite side. Melanchthon had already by his treatment of the Interim given rise to the *Adiaphoristic* controversy (on the limits of toleration in worship): much in ritual, much in organisation even to a limited papal supremacy he was ready to accept. To this controversy were added others. On the positive doctrine of the Holy Eucharist he was Calvinist rather than Lutheran, but in the express negation of the Catholic view he was less decided than Luther; on the question of Predestination—now rapidly coming to

Divisions
of Pro-
testants.

the front—he was somewhat opposed to Calvin, as he allowed more effect to the will of man and some efficacy to good works; with him as with the Jesuits reason made itself heard; here altogether were themes for ample difference. Melanchthon left the colloquy at Worms knowing himself an object of attack. At Regensburg (1556–7) and afterwards the Protestant party found itself divided. “Better Catholic than Calvinist,” said Lutherans. “Can Calvinists be saved?” asked a Lutheran consistory from a pastor. Calvinism was blasphemy; to defend Calvinists were to serve the devil; Calvinists are not our brethren, but the enemies of God, said one Lutheran Court preacher. A three weeks’ colloquy at Naumburg (January, 1561) broke down because the theologians of Jena would have nothing of the union sought by the Palatinate and Württemberg. Under Frederick III. (1559–76) the Palatinate became Calvinist. A board—on the Calvinist model—was set up to manage religious affairs, and the Heidelberg Catechism, to have a great future of its own, was composed (1563). Melanchthon had originally directed the Lutheran organisation in the Palatinate, his early home, and he had counselled Frederick III. to quell the bitter disputes raised by the rigid Lutherans. After Melanchthon’s death (1560) the stronger tendencies gained ground, and Heidelberg became the centre of German Calvinism. At Augsburg (1566) the Elector made a manly defence of his creed, attacked as it was by both Catholics and Lutherans, and his stand did something to gain him respect. But its religious isolation, no less than its local position, turned the Palatinate towards foreign friends and foreign schemes; from the day (1567) when Frederick III.

sent his son John Casimir to help the Huguenots until the Thirty Years' War its outlook was abroad, and its policy brought disaster upon the country.

It is well to review rapidly the outlines of religious changes under the principle "*cujus regio ejus religio*." The North German States were all but solidly Protestant; the exception being the Duchy of Jülich-Cleve (see pp. 113-14) under the Emperor Ferdinand's son-in-law, Duke William, who became Catholic (1570); here Catholicism gained ground once lost. Among the cities, Aachen and Köln alone were Catholic. In Saxony the Grumbach feud (1558-67) brought the Ducal (Ernestine) territory under the care of the (Albertine) Elector Augustus, and he then drove out the extreme Lutherans, thus making all Saxony of a uniform religious type. Afterwards, however, Augustus himself became (1574) jealously Lutheran, saw Crypto-Calvinism everywhere, but specially in the Philippists (or followers of Melancthon), and after this Wittenberg too became a centre of the Flacianists; with some later variations Saxony remained consistently Lutheran. Brandenburg, with which (1571) the Ansbach territory and (1618) the Prussian Duchy were joined, was also Lutheran, and (1566) a Court preacher Funck was executed for Calvinism. But the Elector Joachim Sigismund (1608-19) himself became Calvinist, and his creed was of course tolerated. Although he claimed to have the power of introducing religion as the highest royal prerogative, he did not exercise it. But differing types of faith intensified political jealousy between Brandenburg and Saxony.

**Territorial
changes in
religion.**

The obvious need of unity led to further attempts to

gain it, and these resulted in the Formula of Concord (1577, published 1580), drawn up by six theologians, and signed by fifty-one princes and lords (the Electors Palatine of Brandenburg and of Saxony being among them), thirty-five cities, and over eight thousand theologians. Among the assenting states were the two lines of Brunswick, Mecklenburg, Ducal Saxony, Ansbach, Baden, Württemberg, and the Neuburg Palatinate. But the states of Pomerania, Anhalt, the Zweibrücken Palatinate, Holstein, Hesse and Nassau, with most of the Imperial towns, refused to sign. Among the last were Nürnberg, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Speier, Worms, Magdeburg, and Strassburg (which, however, became Lutheran in 1597). Under John Casimir the Rhine Palatinate became exclusively Calvinist, and the Neuburg Palatinate mainly so. By 1605 all Hesse was also Calvinist. Thus German Protestantism was divided into two great camps, and among the Lutherans of the *Concord* again dogmatic quarrels arose. Outside Germany, Sweden and the Hungarian Lutherans adopted the *Formula*, while Denmark rejected it. All these associations affected the future, and gave rise to further complications. The broad result was that the German Lutherans were parted off from most Protestants outside Germany.

The secularisation of bishoprics, an old evil, and the growth of Calvinism, leading to defections from the *Formula*, summarise much of German history. The princely families had set up a lien upon the sees near them; the Elector of Brandenburg had long nominated to Brandenburg, Havelberg, and Lebus; he also

**Politics
of Protes-
tantism.
Abuses of
bishoprics.**

succeeded in gaining Magdeburg and Halberstadt, both of which were Protestantised (1561-3). The sees of Merseburg (1561) and Naumburg (1564) came to Alexander, the boyish son of Augustus of Saxony; the Elector soon administered not only these sees, but also Meissen. Bremen, Verden, Lübeck, Minden, Schwerin, Ratzeburg, and Cammin were also held by Protestants. Joachim Frederick of Brandenburg was elected Bishop of Havelberg when seven, and Archbishop of Magdeburg when twenty; in 1570 he set about the extinction of Catholicism in his dioceses, and when Pius V. asked for his deposition, the Emperor Maximilian felt unable to enforce it. On his succeeding to the Electorate (1598) his son Christian William followed him at Magdeburg, just as he himself had followed his uncle Sigismund. Henry of Saxe-Lauenburg was Archbishop of Bremen at seventeen (1567), and afterwards gained Osnabrück (1574) and Paderborn (1577). These were great evils, but it should be borne in mind that they arose partly from the degeneracy of Chapters, that the spiritual responsibility of bishops had been too often lost sight of, and their offices looked upon as mere possessions; Catholic dynasties indeed did not differ greatly from Protestants in their treatment of sees. But it was a strange result of all this when (1557-73) Hildesheim, with its medieval monuments and memories, was the only Catholic see in Northern Germany. This abuse was made possible in the following way: when the Chapter had made the election, often forced or corrupt, the elected bishop sought an indult from the Emperor, which freed him from the immediate necessity of going to Rome for Confirmation; the delay was prolonged, but as meanwhile the Emperor gave

him the regalia and he could enjoy the revenue, he did not feel deeply his ecclesiastical incapacity.

The great sees of the West seemed likely to follow. Köln had a varied history: three bishops (1556-67) were either Lutheran or laxly Catholic; the next, Salentin von Isenburg, resigned in order to marry (1577), and Gebhard Truchsess von Waldburg, a man of evil life, was elected by the mainly Protestant Chapter; he was forced by her brothers (1582) to marry his mistress, Agnes von Mansfeld, a canoness of Gerresheim, but meant still to hold his See. The Chapter and the city were divided for and against him, so were the Electors. The Pope deprived him of his see, and Ernest of Bavaria, Bishop of Freising and Administrator of Hildesheim, who had been defeated in the election by two votes, succeeded him. But the dispute grew into a war. The question of the Ecclesiastical Reservation was here raised in an emphatic way, but much as they disliked that clause, the Lutherans disliked union with the Calvinists more, and John Casimir of the Palatinate was Gebhard's only effective supporter. The dispute was made more important by the constant influx, owing to the war in the Netherlands, of Dutch Protestant immigrants, who founded Protestant congregations. The failure of Gebhard's attempt, which had much in its favour, was due more to the divisions of Protestants than anything else. He retired to his deanery of Strassburg, where he died, while his wife went to England, where she incurred Elizabeth's displeasure through her relations with Essex. But the failure came at a critical time, and the restoration of Catholicism in the bishopric, which naturally followed, encouraged other attempts to regain sees for their

rightful use. Two other incidents helped to the same end. Joachim Frederick of Brandenburg, elected Archbishop of Magdeburg (1566), had never received an indult, but at the Diet of Augsburg (1582) he claimed, in spite of this, to vote as Administrator, although not Archbishop. The claim was reasonably disallowed, and thus a blow was struck at a discreditable system.

Magde-
burg, 1582.

The third incident was at Aachen, which had pledged itself to remain Catholic. Flemish immigrants, however, won over a majority of the citizens to Protestantism, and these now demanded (1581) the free exercise of their religion, which was refused by the Catholic Town Council. An appeal to an Imperial Commission was decided in favour of the Council, and riots, in which the bishop's authority was defied, followed. Technically the Religious Peace only protected minorities in towns where they had existed before 1555, and it had not provided for future changes of creed. The Emperor was threatening force, and the Duke of Parma had marched troops across the frontier: the citizens brought their case before the Diet (1582). A new Commission was appointed (1595), and decided against the Protestants, whose worship was prohibited (1598). Thus on all sides the Religious Peace was causing difficulty, and the Catholic Reaction was able to use its legal interpretation in its own favour.

Aachen,
1581-98.

In Trier the Archbishop was driven from the city (1559), and it was not until his successor's time (1567-81) that Catholicism was restored. The Archbishop of Mainz just contrived to hold his own, and in the end even drove the Protestants from his lands of the Eichsfeld

Ecclesiasti-
cal lands.
Trier.
Mainz.

(north of Mühlhausen). Both these prelates made great use of the Jesuits, and the ubiquitous Canisius left his mark in Trier as elsewhere.

The territory of Fulda, the senior abbey of Germany, was largely Protestant, but the Abbot Balthasar Gravel

Fulda. (1571) brought in the Jesuits to found a school, and then expelled all the Protestant

ministers. He met with opposition from the nobility who had wished to found a Protestant school, and the Chapter, whose evil lives he had tried to reform, forced his resignation. An appeal to the Emperor brought

Würzburg. about his tardy restoration (1602). Bishop Julius of Würzburg too took up the Catholic

restoration in his bishopric. He enforced Catholicism (1584) with the alternative of emigration. A hundred and twenty preachers were driven out, and the Jesuits who took their place are said to have reconciled over sixty thousand to the Church. The Franconian knights asked (1582) for the expulsion of the Jesuits, who had been introduced in 1564, for the bestowal of a church upon the Lutherans, and leave for the local priests to marry, but they did not stay the reaction, which was greatly furthered by the bishop's model life. In visitation, confirming, and all his duties, he set a model which surprised the Protestants; his zeal was not purely negative and repressive. For education he also cared, and the University was reformed (1582), while preparatory colleges were erected. Everywhere popular schools were restored or begun; processions and pilgrimages revived; new parishes were formed; three hundred churches were built or restored; hospitals and almshouses sprang up freely; other bishoprics changed like Würzburg: Paderborn (1585), Münster (1588),

Salzburg (1588), Bamberg (1595). Not all these bishops were holy men or deeply spiritual. Sixty years before men of a worldly or indifferent type would have drifted into Lutheranism, now they drifted by the force of their surroundings into Tridentine zeal. The ideal of the Episcopate was restored, and a new life was breathed into the Church. Popular tendencies were now towards Catholicism, and the views and the organisation it presupposed. It was the same in education. The best systems and the best teachers were no longer found among the Lutherans. Among them religious controversy had done its evil work and sapped their power. A new Scholastic had sprung up among them, and its technical science had more to do with speculation than with life. In some places their preachers condemned or did not encourage the study of the dead languages, and there was then as in all days of growing trade a set against studies of no immediate profit.

In the south the cities and lower nobility were mostly Protestant, although the latter did not like to see their superiors, the princes, strengthened by secularisation. But the bishoprics, as seen above, were mostly kept for Catholicism, and Augsburg, under Bishop Otto van Truchsess, Cardinal and (1556) Legate *a latere*, was a good example. He was an ally of Bavaria, and followed its policy. The High School of Dillingen was connected with the College of S. Jerome, which he founded (1549) and generously endowed, partly for general education, partly to train priests for his diocese. Dillingen was (1551) made a University by Julius III., and handed over (1564) to the Jesuits. The college

South
Germany.
Augsburg.

(1565) passed also into their charge as a clerical seminary of the Tridentine type; afterwards the Fuggers (who owed much wealth to Rome and had profited by the shameful traffic in benefices) founded at Augsburg a large college and a gymnasium. Gregory XIII. (1585) placed a seminary at Dillingen, and the diocese became an important centre of activity which worked against the evil living amongst the clergy as well as against the Protestant propaganda. In fifty years (1559-1610) the number of Easter communicants in the city (to take a familiar test) rose from eight hundred to six thousand seven hundred.

In Salzburg George von Khuenberg (1580-7) had done his duty well as a coadjutor and then Archbishop.

Salzburg. His successor, Dietrich von Raittenau (1587-1612), was less conscientious. He bade all non-Catholics to leave his land, but when the Jesuits rebuked his concubinage threatened them likewise; religion of no kind flourished. The next ruler, Marx Sittich von Hohenembs, was earnest in work, and coped with the increase of Protestants by the easy way of expulsion. Many changed outwardly, but the Archbishop's own life of ease and gaiety did not set a good example. In Passau, which took in much

Passau. of the Austrian lands, the preachers were driven out and heretical books forbidden, but this stringency was accompanied by the provision of Catholic schools and teaching. Everywhere the Counter Reformation did most where its bishops were truly pious and enlightened. On the other hand, it was where episcopal rule or Church organisation was weakest (as in Switzerland, North Germany, and the Netherlands) that the anti-Catholic movements spread.

Stringent measures (common on all sides, and therefore needing no apology then, while gaining ready support from the law "*cujus regio ejus religio*") often failed, where not backed up by positive teaching. The German method of persecution was expulsion as opposed to the Spanish *auto de fé*. It was the milder of the two, and it was not as a rule until some years after the Council of Trent that more cruel persecution arose. The Emperor, Ferdinand II., for instance, during the Thirty Years' War, strictly forbade bloodshed, although his measures were stringent.

In the Austrian lands a mixed state of religion prevailed. The Crown and nobles held the patronage of benefices, and had seized most of the revenues. The Estates had allowed (1555-6) the ad-
The Austrian lands.
ministration of the chalice and also clerical marriage. In Hungary the Lutheran organisation had been introduced (1550); in Transylvania (1545); the large powers of the Estates here made any division dangerous, and religion intensified the tumult due to Turkish attacks. In Bohemia Lutheranism had grafted itself upon the Bohemian Brotherhood; monastic houses had been widely secularised. The University of Prague, following its old traditions, had become Lutheran, but the influence of the Jesuits, who came to the city in 1555, spread greatly. The personality of Ferdinand I. (1564) only served to increase the disorder. He himself was genuinely tolerant in administration, but a condition founded upon accident and not on principle could not bring about toleration. His son and successor, Maxi-
The Emperor Maximilian II., 1564-76.
milian II., had been greatly influenced by a secretly Lutheran Court preacher Phauser,

and was suspected of Lutheranism. Up to 1570 he was strongly anti-Spanish, but in that year he and Philip II. became friends. The latter took Maximilian's fourth daughter Anna as wife, and the death of Don Carlos had left Philip sonless (1568), so that visions of Spain came to Maximilian. But his reign, like others, was darkened by the Turkish danger, while on the west the war in the Netherlands brought risks and temptations. Inside the empire he held the balance fairly between the two parties, refusing alike the suggestion of Pius V. to attack the Protestants, and of the Protestants to expel the Jesuits. Tolerant in himself, he yet set toleration before himself less as a principle than as the line of least resistance, and he just failed to hold religion as the thing above all else.

There was in him much of greatness, yet with a weakness which his circumstances would excuse. He enforced neither the Ecclesiastical Reservation nor the Declaration of Toleration. He grew like his father, and not merely under Spanish influence, into stricter conformity to the Church. For the rest the Catholic reaction gained strength as did Protestant disunion. Against the designs of the Elector Palatine he gained (1575) the election to the Roman kingship of his son Rudolf (elected a month earlier King of Bohemia, and King of Hungary, 1572). All these elections meant concessions to the Protestants. The three lay and Protestant Electors insisted that Rudolf should confirm the Religious Peace with its Declaration of Toleration. The three archbishops denied the validity of the Toleration, which was however maintained against them. In the end the jealousies of Saxony and the

Palatinate weakened the opposition, and Rudolf was crowned unconditionally.

At Regensburg (1576) it was proposed to remove the Reservation, and make the ecclesiastical lands thus thrown open bear the cost of Turkish wars. This scheme was rejected through opposition from the two colleges of counts, who did not wish to see the princes strengthened. In this and other ways the religious divisions brought the constitution to a standstill, and led to loss of power abroad, although at home the country grew in wealth. Towards the end of Maximilian's reign the care of Gregory XIII. (1572-85) did much for Germany. So constant was his thought for it that he was said to have "a German heart," and he never said a Mass without intercession for its welfare. Six months after his accession he created a Congregation made up of Germans or cardinals with local knowledge. A reform of German Chapters was one object set before it. Nunciatures at Munich for South Germany (1573), in Styria (1580), and at Köln (1584) strengthened the connection between Germany and Rome. Special diplomatic attention was paid to the princes, and here the Jesuits were useful. Political relations tended to war, and religious controversy was hardening to hatred. The practical work and the very definite aims of the Jesuits, above all, tended in the same direction. Where energy, unaccompanied by constant recurrence to breadth of thought and simplicity of first principles, is thrown largely into organisation, the narrowing of object and the immersion in a system are apt to produce hardness and severity. The lines of the coming struggle were clearly laid down. Maxi-

milian could not avert it, but he did at any rate gain peace in his time (1564-76).

He had conceded a free exercise of the Augsburg Confession to the nobles of Lower Austria (1568), and with intent possibly to please the Protestants and still suit the Catholics, a book of worship was drawn up (mainly by Chytraeus of Rostock) as a compromise, and revised by the Emperor. Ferdinand I. had already consulted George Cassander, a theologian, who had previously formulated a *via media*, and drew up for the Emperor a *Consultatio* with that aim (1564). Styria was much as Lower Austria. In Upper Austria Maximilian reaped a harvest of difficulties due to the double dealing which had gained him the Empire, pledged as he was both to the Pope and the Lutherans, able however to put off the latter more easily. A papal brief (April 16th, 1564) allowed all the German bishops to grant the administration of the chalice to laymen desiring it, provided they professed belief in the sufficiency of communion in one kind, and renounced all the doctrines that had separated Utraquists from the Roman See. In the Austrian lands this was gratefully received, for the upper classes were mainly Protestant, although the lower classes were Catholic. In some of their towns in these duchies Catholics were even excluded from the councils, and in others (as in Grätz) had but one or two representatives. So late as 1578 Protestantism was the prevalent religion in all these territories except the Tyrol, which remained thoroughly Catholic.

But in 1598 when the Catholic revival affected Passau, a diocese including much of Austria, the bishop was able to refuse the chalice to the laity

and in Salzburg the archbishop had refused the concession. In Styria, with Carinthia and Carniola, Charles, son of Ferdinand I., was ruler, and the great advance of Protestantism had led him to invite the Jesuits (1573). To Grätz and three other cities he allowed (1578) freedom of worship, which in the case of Grätz was abused by almost depriving the Catholics of citizenship. Under Charles the reaction was slow in spite of ready help from the Papacy and the Jesuits, but his son Ferdinand (1590), strictly educated and with a conscientious devotion to religion and duty, was a man of sterner stamp than his father, and became the leader of the Catholic movement. His sense of religion and duty was his own, but the mould into which these qualities were cast was that of the Jesuits. He shrank from no bloodless severity; he expelled all Protestant teachers and preachers (1598), and rescinded the allowance of freedom of worship. Thus the measures of Protestant princes were met by retaliation. The examples of these relatives of theirs affected the emperors, and the course of affairs in Bavaria had the same effect.

The peculiar Church conditions of Bavaria have been noted before (p. 45). William IV. (1508-50) had ruled not only strongly, but well, caring for the welfare of the peasants and keeping up the standard of Ingolstadt as a centre of learning, second among Catholic Universities to Louvain only. Albert V. (1550-79) laid the foundation of the celebrated library and the other collections still adorning Munich. The Jesuits by ducal invitation came to the city and founded a college there (1542-56). The Estates complained of the bad discipline of the clergy

**Catholic
reaction.
Austrian
lands.**

Bavaria.

(1553), and asked (1556) for communion in both kinds and relief from the obligation of fasting; afterwards also for clerical marriage. Thus the Duke was in opposition to his nobles, and only when he had overthrown them was he able to carry out his policy. But to conciliate the Estates he had to support their demands at Trent; for a moral reformation he was as anxious as they were. But early in 1564 the Duke by violence suppressed for a time Protestantism in the Ortenburg territory, and although his action was not supported by the Reichskammergericht, the fear of his doing the same elsewhere made the nobles submissive. In a few years the government, exercising powers strictly belonging to the bishops, had, by strict visitation and care for education, changed the country greatly.

The Emperor Rudolf—deeply interested in art, literature, and science, but from the first moody and reserved
The Emperor Rudolf, 1576-1612. —grew more solitary in his later years. He had been brought up in Spain, and his inclinations were for repressing Protestantism, but his first attempts—he expelled the preacher Opitz from Vienna (1578), and tried the same course elsewhere—met with opposition, and he drew back. It was the persistence and success of his cousin Ferdinand (1597) in Styria that led him to revive this earlier policy, and it was this revival that led to the Thirty Years' War. Melchior Klesl—Cardinal and Bishop of Vienna—was the director of his policy. As a poor child Klesl had been trained by the Jesuits, and his ability did credit to their teaching. His wisdom is not to be blamed for the disasters due to Rudolf's growing insanity. The Catholic organisation was re-

stored in Austria (1597), in Styria and Carinthia under Ferdinand (1600-2), and the prohibition of Protestant worship and teaching was strictly carried out. In Bohemia Rudolf (1602) re-enacted a former (1581) edict banishing the Bohemian brethren, and made it cover Calvinists as well. When a synod (1605) adopted the Decrees of Trent, the Bohemians began active opposition. In Hungary also an attempt to reverse the change of churches to Protestantism intensified the national dislike to the Emperor, and to save the realm both Lutheranism and Calvinism had to be allowed. The death of Duke John William of Jülich-Cleve (1509) once more brought up the disputed succession there, and it was only settled after long disputes by the Treaty of Xanten (1614) between the Neuburg and Brandenburg claimants. In the course of the negotiations and fighting the Empire showed its weakness, and religious division its bitterness.

The rightfulness of the secularisation of Church property after 1552 had been questioned in many cases, and notably in those of four convents: Frauenalb, Christgarten, one at Strassburg, and Hirschhorn. The Kammergericht had ordered their restitution, but an appeal for revision was now to be decided. There could be no doubt as to the result, but the Calvinists (now inspired by Christian of Anhalt, a wandering and restless soldier politician, an official of the Palatinate, filled with hatred of the Habsburgs) decided to dispute its enforcement, and to admit in religious disputes no authority but the Diet, the last body to settle anything. The law was clear on the one side, and the facts were clear on the other. Maxi-

**The
decision
about the
four
convents,
1598-1603.**

milian of Bavaria, bold and energetic, was ready for his own policy to oppose the Habsburgs, but here his inclination agreed with the Emperor's power. He meant going with the flowing tide of Catholic reaction to enforce the law. The opposed policy of the Calvinists really meant the breakdown of the Empire, and the matter led to their withdrawal from the Diet (1603).

By this time Rudolf's insanity had become plain, and the succession—in which both Spain and the Papacy took an interest—was merged in the question of his removal. His brother Matthias, who had arranged a peace in Hungary by granting religious freedom to Lutherans and Calvinists, was adopted by the family as their head (April, 1606), and their candidate for the Empire. The relations between him and Rudolf put both at the mercy of the Estates.

In 1604 a disputed election to the See of Strassburg, which had gone on since 1592 between a younger Cardinal of Lorraine and John George of Brandenburg, came to an end after lengthy wars and disputes only by the arbitration of Henry IV. of France. No sooner was this settled than another dispute broke out. The

**Donau-
wörth.** people of the imperial city of Donauwörth were mainly Protestant since 1555: processions held for many years by the Benedictines there were suddenly forbidden by the Council when they became more ornate: the monks persevered, and riots arose: the case came before the Supreme Courts, and a commission was issued to the Duke of Bavaria to inquire into it. Finally the city was put under the ban which Maximilian was to execute. He took the town and restored Catholicism. This set the

Protestants on the alert: the Diet (1608) came to an open rupture. The Protestant States formed at Anhausen (May 16th, 1608) a union, renewed and afterwards enlarged, from which Saxony kept apart. Meanwhile Matthias forced Rudolf to cede to him Hungary, Austria, and Moravia along with the succession in Bohemia. He granted freedom of religion to Austria, and finally Rudolf in Bohemia legalised by the Letter of Majesty the Augsburg Confession. The nobles, knights, and royal towns were allowed to build Protestant churches where needed: on royal domains the people might do the same. Trouble afterwards arose because the Church lands, being managed by the royal treasury, were treated by the Protestants as if they came under the same provision, a mistake at once technical and far reaching. Silesia received like privileges, and only Ferdinand in Styria held his own. In July, 1609, the formation of a Catholic League was the reply to the Evangelical Union. Rudolf was forced to resign Bohemia (1611), and died (January 20th, 1612) in the midst of wild schemes for regaining power, which had thrown all his subjects, and especially the Bohemians, upon the side of Matthias, Matthias. The latter was elected Emperor 1612-1619. (June 18th, 1612), but the Electors made favourable terms for themselves in the transaction. He had made a mistake in bidding for the support of Protestants with whose principles he did not agree, and he favoured the Catholics more than once. The Protestants had built churches at Brunau on land belonging to the Abbey, and at Klostergrab on the lands of the See of Prague, and to this their superiors objected. It was replied that ecclesiastical lands, as controlled by the

Crown, ranked as royal, and therefore admitted the building of churches. But Matthias took the other and more legal view. He contrived to get his determined relative Ferdinand elected King of Bohemia (June, 1617), of Hungary (1618); in yielding to this Bohemia had owned the hereditary right of the Habsburgs and ran a risk of losing their freedom, for they had hoped to elect a Protestant. The expected death of Matthias (which took place March 20th, 1619) could no longer bring relief to his lands. Ferdinand was stricter and more sincere; his subjects would not gain a milder rule by waiting. The church at Brunau was soon closed and that at Klostergrab pulled down, and feeling grew more intense. Under the leadership of Count Thurn (May 23rd, 1618) a national revolt, hastened by outside diplomacy, broke out. The Religious War had at length begun. Christian of Anhalt had been intriguing and reckoning upon it. The war might, with France and Spain at rivalry and keenly interested, become European; at any rate, the German Catholics were only too likely to be thrown upon the side of Spain as the Protestants upon that of France. In Maximilian of Bavaria and Ferdinand the Catholics had leaders of higher type and stronger fibre than any found on the Protestant side. Unhappily these leaders had now resolved to meet innovation by force. It is not our purpose to follow out the war in detail; many features already noted reappear in its course. The dark shadows of France and Spain hide German interests; the Protestant divisions, the weakness of the imperial constitution, the pertinacity of the Counter Reformation are seen again and again. In its later years

**Emperor
Ferdinand
II.,
1619-1637.**

**The Thirty
Years'
War.**

religion is quite lost sight of; it is a war of mere politics and barbarity, which worked untold harm and made misery a thing of daily life.

The war falls into strongly marked periods. (1) The Bohemian War (1618-20), in which the Elector Palatine, Frederick V., son-in-law of James I. of England, was elected King of Bohemia in opposition to Ferdinand, but lost both his new kingdom and his old territory. The Union failed to support him; indeed by the Treaty of Ulm (June, 1620) it pledged itself to neutrality against the League; the North German Protestants stood far aloof. The rebellion had spread to Austria and Moravia, but Maximilian and Tilly, fighting for the League, carried all before them. The Upper Palatinate was lost and also the Lower (or Rhenish) in 1622; the Electorate was given to Maximilian (1623), who also received the Upper and the Lower Palatinate (1628), the former of which he kept permanently. Here, as in the Emperor's own lands, Catholicism was restored through great severity and with the alternative of emigration. In these campaigns (1620-24) the Emperor (elected August 28th, 1619) gained ground greatly.

Periods of the war.

I. The Bohemian War and its sequel, 1618-1624.

(2) Christian IV. of Denmark, chosen as Director of the Lower Saxon Circle (where lay most of the secularised sees), intervened. He was a political Protestant without much religious feeling, but he interfered for his interests in North Germany, where he was Duke of Holstein, and where he had laid hands upon the Sees of Bremen and Verden. So far the burden of war had fallen upon the League and its army under Tilly, a

II. The Danish intervention, 1625-1629.

rough and fierce but devoted and sincerely religious soldier. Now, however, Wallenstein, sprung from a noble German family settled in Bohemia, a convert from Protestantism and with Habsburg associations, offered to raise an army for the Emperor. He hoped at once to strengthen the imperial power and carve out a principality for himself. But he stood outside religious associations, and was served equally by Catholic and Protestant soldiers. From the first he roused against himself the princes, whose dislike of the Habsburg power was their leading principle and outweighed their Catholicism. In the course of the war he also brought upon himself the anger of those who wished to build up political associations upon a purely religious basis. Of his greatness, his real genius, there could be no doubt; whether he could be easily fitted into a scheme of politics remained to be seen. His great success led to his being made Duke of Mecklenburg (February, 1628), and he seemed likely to found a strong Northern power. Christian IV. made peace with the Emperor (1629), and another period of the war was ended. The Emperor, the army led by Wallenstein, the League represented by Maximilian, and the clergy inspired now above all by the Papal Nuncios (such as Caraffa), were the leading forces on the Catholic side, and the interests of their parties were rapidly growing apart. By this time Ferdinand had put down Protestantism in his own territories—Austria, Moravia, Silesia, and Bohemia; even some ordinary civil rights were denied to Protestants. Easter, 1626, was fixed as the date by which all non-Catholics were to have left Bohemia, and thirty thousand families were said to have been moved. In Hun-

gary at a later date (1645) Ferdinand III. was forced, however, to restore some churches to Protestants. Behind the soldiers who saw to the expulsion of ministers and teachers came the Jesuits and the Monastic Orders; emigration of dissenters and instruction of those who remained completed the process. The first stage of the Emperor's policy was now finished; his own lands were secured for his own religion. It seemed as if he might even go further, win more of Germany for the Counter Reformation, and along with that restore the imperial power to its former greatness. This policy was expressed in the Edict of Restitution.

This Edict enjoined that all bishoprics, monasteries, and other Church lands not held directly from the Emperor which had been secularised since 1552 were to be restored to the Catholics; all those held directly which had passed to Protestants since 1555 (and therefore contrary to the Reservation) were also to return to Catholics. All Catholic princes could compel their subjects to adopt Catholicism, or to leave the country on receiving money to do so. The Religious Peace was only to apply to Lutherans; Calvinists and Zwinglians were not to be tolerated. This Edict applied to some fourteen sees and one hundred and twenty other foundations at least. If it had been carried out it would have done for North Germany what had already been done for the South; but it was carried out only in Elsass, Franconia, and the Lower Saxon Circle. Incidentally the Emperor could thus provide for younger members of his family, such as his son, the Archduke Leopold, who was now elected Bishop of Halberstadt.

**Edict of
Restitu-
tion, 6th
March,
1629.**

But the Elector John George of Saxony, hitherto loyal, and the League, strongly Catholic but also anti-Habsburg, were turned against the Emperor by the Edict. Maximilian of Bavaria suggested its postponement for forty years, and the Elector asked its repeal. All parties united against Wallenstein, who was likely to make the Emperor too great and destroy the freedom of Germany. While the Edict only interpreted the existing law correctly, it did not allow for existing facts and for processes hard to undo; it put hardship upon some who were not to blame for the original fault. It was well that greedy princes should be reminded of their limitations, but there were some of humbler rank who suffered more. And the manner in which the Edict was enforced—along with the proscription of Protestantism elsewhere—really retarded the cause it was meant to serve. Here and there, as in Prague and the Upper Palatinate, the new clerics were surprised at the ease with which the masses returned to Catholicism, but the true cause of this was that their previous Protestantism had been founded upon persuasion rather than conviction, and was the result of princely or baronial influence rather than of spiritual change. Elsewhere a real and lasting harm was done to religion by the use of force to coerce the conscience, instead of merely removing a hindrance to its freedom of play. It was strange that Urban VIII.—a Pope led mainly by political considerations, unlike Gregory XV., who had subsidised the Emperor and urged him to persevere—did not welcome Ferdinand's increase of power. For a time he refused subsidies, and would not allow the war to be called religious; he would not even allow Ferdinand to name the first

holders of the benefices regained, and he did not approve the handing over to the Jesuits of recovered foundations, since this removed them from episcopal control. It was more politically important that the imperial success roused France to new efforts and interference, first by diplomacy and then by war.

(3) Even more striking was the interference of Sweden under Gustavus Adolphus. The traditions of his family were Protestant. By his tact he had gained peace at home, and he had experience in war. He had even thought of entering the war before he did. He came nearer the heroic mould than anyone else in the war, combining as he did the simplicity

III.

**Gustavus
Adolphus.**

**June, 1630,
to November, 1632.**

of the northern people with a deep devotion to his religious ideals. It may be true that he had his own objects to gain. He undertook something of an adventure, but its results would be more for his religion than for himself. He intervened just when the second stage of the war—the stern use of force in the Edict of Restitution—had been reached, and when if Protestantism, held by him essential to the world, was to be saved, help must go to Germany from outside. But if he stood for Protestantism he also stood for the freedom of religious choice, just as Luther had done for the individual conscience, and that is why his character has always commanded sympathy. He was something of a great general and something of a great leader. He defeated Tilly and Wallenstein. The Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony were moved by him from their neutrality. He founded a school of generals and a system of tactics. His victory at Breitenfeld (September 7th, 1631) secured the safety

of the North and opened the South. His plans—foiled by his death at Lützen (November 6th, 1632)—included the formation of a great *Corpus Evangelicorum* with himself at its head. Historic traditions would have been violated, Napoleon's map of Germany anticipated, the breakdown of the empire hastened. This new division of the empire would have been permanently bound up with religion, but it seems also likely that in his new territory religious liberty would have been left to Catholics. His great aim was to defend Protestantism, and with it liberty, and in doing it he gained territory for himself and his cause.

(4) Under the diplomatic guidance of the Swedish minister Oxenstiern and the military command of Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar the war went on. The league of Heilbronn (April 23rd, 1633) united under Sweden the circles of Swabia, the Upper and Lower Rhine and Franconia (where Bernhard hoped to form a duchy out of Bamberg and Würzburg). But Saxony stood apart, and at length by the Peace of Prague (May 30th, 1635) made a preliminary peace with the Emperor. But before this Wallenstein's too great success and power had led to his second dismissal (for he had been re-employed), his lapse into treason, and his assassination (February 25th, 1634). This living cause of jealousy removed, Bavaria and the Habsburgs drew closer together. Spain was more than ever interested in the Catholic cause, and France stronger at home under Richelieu, and long the secret supporter of the Protestants, now plunged openly into the war. Thus a disastrous and blighting struggle, which might have

IV. The
war after
Gustavus.

French in-
tervention,
1635-1648.

ended in 1634, was prolonged for fourteen years. But the Peace of Prague foreshadowed its end, and this peace came after the disastrous Protestant defeat at Nördlingen (September 6th, 1634).

By it the Elector of Saxony made peace for the Lutherans, and for them alone. So far as they were concerned the Emperor gave up the Edict of Restitution. They—at least those of the Augsburg Confession—were allowed liberty of worship in the Empire except in Bohemia and the Austrian hereditary lands. All mediate Church lands (*i.e.* those not held of the Emperor) were to remain as in 1552. If secularised then they remained so. All secularised immediate Church lands, reconquered since November 11th, 1627, were left to their secular holders (thus most of the northern sees were left to the Protestants). All mediate lands remained as in 1552; all immediate as in 1627, but the whole arrangement might be reconsidered in forty years' time; an amnesty with few exceptions was allowed. Thus the Emperor really compromised with the Lutherans and surrendered much, while they were practically bought. He also gained support for his son as successor in the Empire, and secured the see of Halberstadt for his younger son Leopold. The Pope (Urban VIII.) disapproved of the peace; the Capuchins, now coming to the front and marked by a national feeling lost among the Jesuits, approved. Among some Jesuits the opinion was that the peace was really a snare for Saxony, that the concessions made were more apparent than real, and would only divide the Protestants.

Peace of
Prague,
May 30th,
1635.

The religious element in the war was now overlaid

by the political. The Treaty of Paris (November, 1634) had secured for the Protestants the help of France (now and since August, 1624, guided by Richelieu), but to gain this help Elsass was to be given up. Thus

religious divisions played into the hands of
Ferdinand III., France. On Ferdinand's death he was suc-
1637. ceeded by his son Ferdinand III., King of

Hungary and (since December 22nd, 1636) King of the Romans. The new Emperor was strict and regular in habits, careful and discreet, and although pious lacked the enthusiasm of his father. The war under him was utterly merged in the duel between Spain and France, while Germany was weary of war. Negotiations for peace had begun in 1645, and in 1648 the Treaty of Westphalia, made up of the Treaty of Münster between the Empire and France, and that of Osnabrück between the Empire and Sweden, was completed. With the political terms, forming a basis for European politics during one hundred and fifty years, we have little to do; the cession of land to France and Sweden, and the influence given to these powers in the empire, was disastrous to the national life of Germany.

The secularisation of sees was confirmed. Sweden gained Bremen and Verden; Brandenburg took Halber-

stadt (the Archduke Leopold became Bishop
Treaty of of Strassburg), Minden, Cammin, and in the
Westphalia, end Magdeburg also; Mecklenburg received
1648.

Schwerin and Ratzeburg; Brunswick-Lüneburg the alternate nomination to Osnabrück. Many secularised abbeys were similarly used as "compensations." The acknowledged independence of Switzerland and the United Provinces recognised facts less open to

criticism than these secularisations. The old *reservatum ecclesiasticum*, the cause of so much trouble, was done away with, and for most of the Empire the term (January, 1624) was taken as the norm. All benefices were to remain in the hands of the religion then in possession. For the Palatinate, Baden, and Württemberg the date 1618 was taken, but had this earlier year been taken throughout the Empire, the changes in the Habsburg hereditary lands would have been disallowed as later in date. If in future a holder of a benefice changed his religion he was to lose his office. A state was to remain as it was at the normal date. The right of reformation was given to the princes only to be exercised with the approval of the people, and where direct sovereignty was possessed, so that this right was denied to the imperial cities; in them the dominant religion was to remain as such. This right of reformation gave to the princes great powers of interference, and by implication adopted a theory of State relations as often assumed in practice as decried in theory, but it was hardly brought into play. Thus all the tendencies of religious strife and political greed so long at work were crystallised and made a permanent part of the constitution. Religious toleration was gained, and Calvinists were now treated the same as Lutherans of the Augsburg Confession and Catholics. Many regulations guarded the rights of Protestants in Imperial relations and judicial suits. Then the Empire settled down to the tremendous task of repairing the desolation and healing its misery, but religion remained for long a thing of territory and politics rather than of the inner life. The Empire had been sacrificed by Austria to its religious and dynastic aims, by others to

their less lofty greed. Inside the Austrian lands Catholicism held undisputed sway; in the Empire religion was free. In comparison with the policy of others, that of the Habsburgs is just redeemed from vulgarity and selfishness by its vision of the ancient Empire and its religious earnestness. For the rest the princes seemed now to have become everywhere the keepers of religion, and real spirituality was likely to perish under their care as had the national life.

In the negotiations for peace papal legates—four, one after the other—were present, but the conditions upon which they insisted were disregarded. **The treaty and the Papacy.** Church property should not be dealt with; Sweden and the Elector-Palatine should not be allowed to gain; but their protests to these ends were of no use. Europe had now passed out of political tutelage to the Pope; the legate Chigi protested against the Peace, and Innocent X. (*Zelo Domus Dei*, November 20th, 1648) annulled it so far as it was against the See of Rome, the Catholic Church, or clerical discipline. But the treaty itself had provided that the opposition of any power, temporal or spiritual, should be disregarded, and the condemnation had thus no result except as the beginning of a policy which has often since then placed the Papacy in opposition to national wishes and interests in Germany and elsewhere. The Papacy had chosen to make political results its great end. The Council of Trent had, on the other hand, strengthened its spiritual powers, and these remained unaffected by the treaty or its rejection; its political claims were, however, openly disregarded. Spain, too, which earlier in the year (January, 1648) had made peace with the

Netherlands and acknowledged their independence, protested against the treaty. This was no wonder, for in Spain more than anywhere else the hope of undoing the work of the Reformation had been cherished, and henceforward that hope in its largest shape was impossible, in spite of the almost wonderful progress of the Counter Reformation. But just as a century earlier Catholicism had gained by the hatred between Lutheran and Calvinist, so now Protestantism had gained by the rivalry between France and Spain. Political problems and not religious were to be henceforth the primary difficulties and duties of States; this was an axiom princes had been forced to learn, but which the Papacy had chosen to disregard. The Treaty of Westphalia laid a purely political basis for the future, and it was not without significance that the Holy Roman Empire—the distinctive dream of the Middle Ages as an embodiment of spiritual unity expressed in politics—had now by this treaty changed its character and lost its power.

CHAPTER XII

ENGLAND

WHEN Henry VIII. came to the throne (1509) he typified in wealth, popularity, and power the new monarchy that had arisen. If the country was thus strong at its summit, it was even stronger at its base. No State could compare with it in the coherence and liberty of its local life. **Henry VIII., 1509-47.** There were many problems left for solution, many difficulties to be dealt with. But the Middle Ages had been greater in building up institutions than in defining ideas, and this was no disadvantage; more problems are solved by the man of action than by the man of thought, although they may press more acutely upon the latter. The Middle Ages, however, had been slow to perceive contradictions in its system unless practical difficulties presented themselves. There had been of old conflicts between the Papal and the kingly power just as there had been inevitably between the political and religious societies. Statutes, such as that of Provisors, limiting the Pope's right to fill up English benefices by providing them for chosen occupants, and that of Præmunire forbidding the bringing into England of Papal Bulls, had expressed and hardly composed these conflicts. Impatience had been often felt at the Papal jurisdiction,

and the way in which it was exercised; tested by its utility in action or on behalf of morals it could not be rated highly. At Rome, says the English chronicler, Adam of Usk (1402), "everything was bought and sold, so that benefices were given not for worth, but to the highest bidder . . . and therefore as when under the Old Testament the priesthood was corrupted with venality, the three miracles ceased, namely, the unquenchable fire of the priesthood, the sweet smell of sacrifice which offended not, the smoke which ever riseth up; so I fear it will come to pass under the New Testament, and methinks the danger standeth daily knocking at the very doors of the Church." It was the Roman jurisdiction thus exercised which had aroused so much feeling in England; the non-resident holders of benefices to which they had been "provided" kept alive the irritation of an old grievance; the ever-growing number of ecclesiastical lawyers, then as always the bane and degradation of the Church, found in the Roman Canon Law a complete system, which, however, presupposed authoritative Papal legislation. Technically the Canon Law (which was not, of course, *de fide*) had no force in England unless accepted by the national synods and allowed by royal permission; but practically, as might have been expected, the lawyers trained in its principles always sought to apply it. And the ecclesiastical courts, with their inquisitions into private lives and petty details, were increasingly unpopular. Alike to the ecclesiastical lawyer who approved and to the ignorant laity who disapproved of them, the ecclesiastical courts formed a pyramid, converging in the Curia. But the feeling of England towards the Papacy at the begin-

ning of the sixteenth century was rather one of indifference than of active dislike.

Beyond the anti-papal legislation there had been other signs of coming difficulties and contests between
Royal papal and royal power; the question of
and Papal the King's supreme power had been raised
Relations. as early as 1515 in the argument between Convocation and the popular Minorite, Dr. Standish (later on an opponent of Erasmus). "We are," said Henry VIII., "by the sufferance of God, king of England, and the king of England in times past never had any superior but God." Again, when the King wrote his book against Luther, he showed it to Sir Thomas More (1522), who made a curious criticism: "I must put your Grace in mind of one thing, and that is this, the Pope, as your Grace knoweth, is as great a prince as you are. It may hereafter fall out that your Grace and he may vary upon some point: whereupon may grow breach of amity and war between you." But to Henry's mind at that time his relations with the Papacy could not be too close, although with varying politics he varied in the warmth of his affections. Sir Thomas More had seen indeed that Papal Supremacy was to be the crucial question of the day, and had therefore studied it carefully; in the end he came to the conclusion, different from that of many others, that the Papal Supremacy was grounded in Scripture and essential to the Church. But it was significant that so acute an observer had singled out the point as important. For the present Henry was firm in his attachment to the Papacy, but how long he would keep so was yet to be seen. "I am," he said to Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador, "the

Pope's good son, and shall ever be with his Holiness and with the Church, from which I mean never to depart; and I think I have sufficient power with his Holiness to warrant hopes of my making him adhere to whichever side I choose." This was of Leo X. in 1515, and again in 1517 he could say, "*Pontifex est meus.*" Clement VII. also had a personal affection for Henry, due not only to favours received, but to hopes for the future. And yet in 1525 Wolsey could hold out a threat that the whole realm of England would become Lutheran. So far had ecclesiastical relations, the growth of ages, and taken for the most part on trust, become matters of political convenience; so fast had a crisis in these relations developed.

As to the general condition and efficiency of the Church in England strongly opposed statements are often made. It should not be forgotten **Condition of the Church.** that too great reliance upon the Monastic Orders and the friars tended to put the ordinary machinery of the Church out of gear; soreness arose between the diocesans and the secular or parochial clergy; while the laity were often inclined to take part in the struggles. The popularity of the friars, as shown by legacies left to them, was far greater than that of either secular priests or monks; the friars coming with their popular sermons (or sermon, if their stock-in-trade was limited) and their easy manners were a welcome change from the parish priests. The bishop and the archdeacons, always remote and often involved in quarrels over local jurisdiction, were never very popular and often very unpopular. Thus there resulted a dislocation of the ecclesiastical machinery which needed more regular visitations and

a more favourable atmosphere to work efficiently in the absence of a great enthusiasm. The comparative rarity of synods and the tendency for visitations to become matters of form (if not worse matters of fees) were indeed signs of a lack of enthusiasm and of something closely bound up with it, the preoccupation of the higher clergy in affairs of State or secular business. This evil was undoubted, and nothing did more to lower the respect felt for the clergy. The higher clergy, as individuals, were not popular or even influential. But the Church as a body was still respected and obeyed; the form of its working machinery, synods, and visitations continued sufficiently for a revival in the hands of reformers. In ecclesiastical as in constitutional history it is of the utmost importance that forms capable of being revived should remain even if for a time ineffective.

The Monastic Orders may have lost their former zeal, but they had not sunk to the low level of life that satirists and unfounded traditions ascribed to them. Although Warham's Visitation (1511) showed in many cases financial mismanagement, defects, and sometimes small dishonesties in house-keeping or care of property, there were few moral evils and certainly no widespread corruption. Some monasteries needed (as S. Albans had in 1499) reproof and received it; numbers were diminishing, and for many years new foundations and additional endowments of the old had nigh ceased: pious founders preferred to endow hospitals or chantries. Thus from Henry IV. to Henry VIII. only eight monasteries were founded, but about sixty colleges or hospitals. The variation in the

endowments of chantries (where a single priest said masses for the founder) is instructive: for Yorkshire, 1350-1400 A.D., the number was forty-eight; 1400-50 it was twenty-eight; 1450-1500 it was sixty-one; from 1500-50 it was forty-seven; the drop in the fifteenth century, if due to Lollard influence, had been only temporary, and eventually the old doctrines had lost no favour. If the feeling of piety then remained the same, the lessening zeal for monasteries is still more significant; clearly they no longer met a need of the age, and indeed the visitations and all our evidence show no very high standard of usefulness or devoutness of life. Broadly speaking, society felt the need of a life of retirement less than it had done in bygone ages; many men and women took up the life of rule without a distinct vocation for it; there were many houses that were places of pleasant retirement for the rich, and others that were places of easy life for the poor. While there were, as Erasmus said, types of the highest life to be found in monasteries, they no longer preserved, as of old, a higher general standard of life than the outside world. They still served their old purpose of schools; they were still, though with less economic and agricultural success, landlords of fairly generous views; but their religious functions were not so well performed. The need of reform had been widely felt; Archbishop Morton (1487) under Henry VII. had planned, and Archbishop Warham (1511) had partly carried out an important visitation: the results of which agree with the above statements.

If we turn to the secular clergy we find the leading churchmen belonging to them, and not as before to the Monastic Orders; their general level of life was,

as always, dependent upon that of the outside world and a little above it. But their great
The immersion in business and politics, where
Secular they were successful rivals of laymen, went
Clergy. against them and lessened their efficiency as a class. There is no reason to accuse them of any widespread immorality, but there was a wide difference between the Church's standard of clerical celibacy and the frequent concubinage punished lightly, if at all. The teaching power of the Church was, of course, not limited either to sermons or to catechisings. The frequency of preaching is often underestimated, and the collections of medieval sermons show a readiness to preach; the popular mission sermon was a creation of the friars, and not of the Reformers. But the teaching assigned to the parish priest, apart from the more secular instruction often given by the chantry priests, was often most important. Every parish priest was bound to expound to his parishioners the chief points of Christian doctrine and practice; for a public mostly uneducated, these expositions were of necessity simple, and they were so far the ordinary rule as to escape frequent mention. But the number of manuals for use in such instruction shows the importance given to it, as do the large proportion of religious works issued by the early presses. The religious controversies of the Reformation could not have arisen or have been popular among people untaught or ignorant of Christian creed or duty. The point then disputed was not whether a priest should preach or teach, but what, and in what manner, he was to preach and teach. The simple piety of the English people, their regular attendance at church, where on week-days they said

their offices as monks did elsewhere, and their frequency at mass, struck a Venetian ambassador (1500) as remarkable. Not improbably this widespread love of the Hour Offices led in later days to the popularity of the Morning and the Evening Prayers modelled upon them. The Sarum Offices had a beauty of their own, even if they were more complicated than the Roman Use.

The New Learning had perhaps penetrated more deeply into the life of England than of any other country, Italy excepted. But whereas in Italy it was the pagan side of the movement that went the deepest, in England it was the theological and religious. This was partly because England had only two Universities, in both of which the revival of learning gained firm footing at an early date. Colet, at Oxford, came rather in the second generation of teachers of this class, and his lectures upon the Greek New Testament were in the spirit of what Erasmus called "sound learning," reverent, practical, learned, and not widely speculative. English Universities and English scholars seemed to have changed their character since the time when brilliance and paradox had been held the characteristic of English thought, as solidity and accuracy were of French. Sir Thomas More, whose *Utopia* has carried his name where neither his learning nor martyrdom could have done, was the central figure of the English movement: the host of Erasmus, the friend of Colet, the pupil of "sound learning" in high judicial and political place. But two features of his life are to be noted. First, his theology was essentially medieval; he had no sympathy whatever with the doctrines of Lutheranism; he had

**The New
Learning.**

hardly any tenderness for either heretic or heresy. And, secondly, he must be judged by the simple pathos and Christian peace of his Chelsea home. It is a perfect picture of a Christian household, and it shows us on the very eve of the religious revolution what medieval Christianity invigorated by the New Learning could not only idealise but actually produce. More's theology was the theology of the movement in England. This theology cannot be gathered from the *Utopia* alone; his household was the type of practical life the movement aimed at producing. And for many years under Henry VIII. and Warham it seemed as if this movement, which Wolsey's administration and scholastic foundations went to help, would control or shape the Church in England. That it did not so in the end was due to two causes—the matter of the King's divorce and the adverse influence of the Lutheran movement abroad.

Recent studies of the "Divorce" (or as it should be called, a suit for the nullity of marriage) have shown that the real cause is to be found, not in "The King's Matter." any doubts or scruples felt by others or himself, but in Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn and his desire to have a legitimate male heir to the throne. Wolsey, seeking to strengthen the newly-formed French alliance, was for some time ignorant of this, and hoped, after pleasing his master by gaining the divorce, to strengthen his position by a new marriage with a French princess. The negotiations and despatches between England and Rome give us a low idea of Henry's character (he even sought permission to have two wives at once upon Old Testament models) and of Wolsey's diplomatic methods;

they further prove the scanty respect felt for the Papacy of the time. Nor was the policy of the Papacy straightforward in all ways. The question was first raised in the spring of 1527. In May Clement was taken prisoner; as Charles's captive he dared not offend him by an insult to his aunt, Queen Katherine; at the same time his wish to please Henry led him to temporise. Questions of right and wrong seemed to fall into the background; it was even suggested to Henry that he should act upon the assumption he was right, and leave the problem of two wives to settle itself. Finally, although tardily and against his judgment, the Pope signed a decretal commission giving Wolsey and Campeggio power to declare the law when the requisite facts had been obtained. Had this been acted upon (and the Pope expressly promised not to reverse the decision) Wolsey, whose good faith there was every reason to doubt, could have annulled the marriage without appeal. Of the real injustice of Henry's contention the Pope seems rightly to have had no doubt, yet every pressure was put upon the unhappy Queen to retire into a nunnery and let judgment go by default. With the admission of her appeal to Rome (June 13th, 1529) all doubt as to the result was at an end, especially as the Pope and Emperor were now in league. Henry had been balked, and his anger was roused. Wolsey, the greatest of English ministers, fell a sacrifice to the King, who was now learning his strength. Events hurried rapidly on. It was necessary to put a decent gloss upon the King's cause, and hence the appeals to the universities of Europe, not on the legality of the original dispensation but on the power

of the Pope to pronounce upon such a case at all. And finally an obedient Parliament, little unwilling to take such action, supported by a Convocation much the same in temper, put an end to all ecclesiastical relations with Rome. There had been many matrimonial causes as dishonourable to the kings concerned, some of them honourable to Popes who had stood for righteousness; there had been few so dishonourable to all concerned save to the suffering Queen. There had been none destined in a world of inflammable politics and political relations to bring about such a vast result. For henceforth if Catholicity depends upon the admission of papal jurisdiction and connection with Rome, the Church in England was to lose her Catholicity. That is, in one sense, a theological question upon which at the very outset Eastern and Western Christians might hold differing views; it is, in another sense, a historical question, the answer to which is to be sought from the early rather than from the medieval Church itself. To most Englishmen of that day it presented itself as a change in external relations and in those alone.

Wolsey was indicted for breach of Præmunire (October 9th, 1529) and replaced as Chancellor by

Wolsey's Sir Thomas More: of all his offices he was
Fall. only allowed to keep his Archbishopric

of York, to which see he journeyed for the first time now in his disgrace. While awaiting his installation he received a summons to London on a charge of high treason, and it was on his journey to the Tower he died (S. Andrew's Eve, 1530), at Leicester Abbey. His had been a striking figure: the able statesman of low birth ranking among princes, but statelier

and grander than they, entering into their politics with a skill and a wisdom England was to miss most sorely. He played in England the part that some Popes of the day—respectable, but not spiritual, patrons of learning but not models of religious life—played in Rome itself. But his career shows how politics was all the world, how even to men not paltry in their minds or ignoble in their aims everything turned upon the relations of dynasties and kings. The tide of religious earnestness was rising even if the air was full of strife and bitterness. The Lutheran movement had thrown much of that earnestness upon the side of disruption; earnestness on the Catholic side had yet to find its centre. In England the death of Wolsey removed the one ecclesiastical statesman who might have directed the currents of the time instead of being swept away by their force.

Henry VIII. now entered upon a career of absolute power, and was guided by himself alone. He still kept his love of learning, but learning, like commerce, flourishes best in quiet atmosphere, Henry VIII. disturbed by little change. He never altered his doctrinal faith, although Lutherans from the Continent looked to him for help, and were sometimes encouraged for political reasons. If, on the one side, he left untouched the internal organisation of the Church, developed its growing national tendencies, and carried out the policy of independence indicated by kings before him, on the other side his hand was heavy and his greed great. The power he claimed and exercised in ecclesiastical matters was in truth little more than could be seen at work in Spain or Bavaria or in France with its Gallican liberties; but

his assertion of the royal power against that of the Papacy, was bolder and stronger than other kings had cared to make. Other kings, Catholic and Protestant, had freely applied confiscation to ecclesiastical property, and it had been the main motive of the Swedish Reformation. Other kings had played with ecclesiastical problems as pawns in the game of politics. But the peculiarity of Henry's policy was to combine all these characteristics into one effective whole. He did it too with a reckless force that did not stop to consider consequences; at times he risked everything, and his bold front was often the strongest support of his throne; he was often unpopular, and rebellion often came nearer to success than it thought. So that his personality counts for even more in the changes of his reign than is sometimes supposed; his persistent courage no less than his capricious selfishness needs to be emphasised. The past history of the English Church may account for much that happened, but only when other countries are taken into account can the changes of his reign be understood. He could do what he did, not only because he was king in the England of Henry II., of Edward I., and of Wolsey, but because he was living in the Europe of Charles V., of Christian II., and Gustavus Vasa—the Europe where Julius II. and Leo X. had just been buried, and where Clement VII. was a political influence.

In November, 1529, the Parliament met, and its spirit was seen to be hostile to the clergy, or, at any rate, to the ecclesiastical courts. Fees for probate cases, mortuaries (fees paid at burials), pluralities of benefices (even if held by papal licence), and non-residence were

The Re-
formation
Parlia-
ment.

specially attacked. Some of these abuses both Warham and Wolsey had tried to reform, and the Convocation, which met at the same time, made many provisions for reform in life and clerical discipline. But a heavy and unexpected calamity now fell upon the Church. In 1531 the whole Church and clergy were accused of Præmunire for having recognised Wolsey's Legatine Court. It was worth noting that Wolsey's appointment as legate (1518) had been made at the King's special request, and that a judge like Bishop Fox of Winchester had looked for great reforms through the power thus conferred. For this offence the clergy paid a fine equal to two million of modern money levied as a subsidy. Still more, they admitted that the King was Supreme Head of the English Church and clergy so far as the law of Christ allowed. The title (yielded after a struggle) might mean some new or only the old powers claimed by former kings and by Henry himself in a proclamation (September, 1530) on the rigid enforcement of the Provisors. An explanation furnished by the King favoured the latter sense. In 1532 the Commons, secretly moved by royal influence, complained of the clergy's legislation for themselves, and also of the ecclesiastical courts. A controversy between the King and Convocation followed, which ended in the Submission of the clergy, May 15th, 1532. By it no new Canons were to be made without the King's consent, and the existing Canon Law was to be examined by a commission of thirty-two. (This commission was appointed later on, but the result of their labours is unknown. Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum* was a similar task undertaken by himself.) Protests were not wanting, as, for instance,

that made by Tunstall, the learned Bishop of Durham, and the course of the discussion was tedious. But the final result was that whether the King's new title meant little or much, the Church was powerless, at any rate for a while, in his grasp. Against this condition there was not only protest but struggle.

But it should be strongly insisted upon that Convocation, the assembly of clergy, not kings or princes **Convoca-** or parliaments, had already marked out **tion.** the path of reform. Bishops were to be **1532.** stricter in their visitations, both of parish priests and monasteries; greater stress was to be laid upon clerical residence and a higher standard for Holy Orders was to be kept up; episcopal officials were to be restrained in their exactions of fees; teaching and preaching were to be better provided for; clerical offenders strictly punished; heresies put down and heretical books suppressed; the parochial poor better relieved. These were prevalent evils; but this clerical Reformation, anticipating the best results of Trent, was thwarted by the Submission of the clergy and the attacks of the King and Commons upon their liberties. The presentation of the Submission to Henry was one of Warham's last public acts. He died August 23rd, 1532, and that very day Sir Thomas More resigned his chancellorship. The Church of England was passing into drifts and currents which he had no wish to enter.

Meanwhile Henry's suit was not pronounced upon at Rome, and the relations of King and Papacy were **Anti-Papal** fluctuating and undeveloped. The Statute **Legisla-** of Provisors was diligently enforced, and a **tion.** proclamation for that purpose was issued (September 19th, 1530). In 1532 the payment of

annates (a first year's income, levied first in the twelfth century by some bishops, which, after becoming commoner in the thirteenth century, was levied by the Pope for himself in 1306) was left to the King's pleasure, and was converted to his use by Royal Warrant in 1533, confirmed by statutes in 1534. This was the beginning of the Anti-Papal legislation, and in the latter year the statute for Restraint of Appeals removed all papal jurisdiction in England. Previous statutes had limited it, this abolished it, while still treating it as a matter of legal economy, and not entering upon the question of the Roman Primacy in itself. The final act for the Restraint of Annates put the appointment of bishops on its present footing, the royal nomination, election under the *congé d'élire*, and consecration being left without papal confirmation. At the same time Peter's Pence and all other payments to the Pope for dispensation or other purposes were abolished; all such future dispensations were to be issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In November, 1534, the Act of Supremacy, giving to the King the title of Supreme Head with a right of visitation (hinted at as regards the exempt monasteries by the statute for the Restraint of Appeals), was passed. Earlier in the year a Succession Act—which events had made necessary—was passed condemning the King's first marriage, and sanctioning that with Anne Boleyn, which had already taken place. To this Act—to its justice as well as its force—all persons might be called upon to swear, and it was for refusing this oath, from conscientious reasons, that More and Fisher were committed to prison. Their subsequent deaths, for which no excuse of expediency

could be offered, is perhaps the greatest stain upon a reign that is clouded by many others.

Early in 1533 Henry had privately married Anne Boleyn, and on May 28th Cranmer, who had succeeded Warham (March 30th, 1533), his appointment being accompanied by the usual Bulls, declared the King's first marriage void, *ab initio*. Against the expected papal judgment, which came March 23rd, 1533, and came in accord with justice—although signs of wavering had been many—Henry had appealed to a general Council. But the session which abolished Papal Appeals from England had already begun before this sentence was given.

There was little reason why bishops or clergy should, at that time, defend the Papacy. Gardiner—himself a former emissary to Rome in the King's matter—was no less strongly a supporter of what had been done than was Cranmer himself. For the present there was, on the other hand, no sympathy with the Lutherans, although efforts at an alliance with them were made. The inducements to such an alliance were political, the obstacles were doctrinal. Henry's attitude towards the Papacy was, however, not without weight in deciding the Lutherans against the Council at Mantua, to which Paul III. had invited them. But, as regards England, the separation of the realm from the Papacy was, as yet, something that it seemed possible for later events to reverse. It depended mainly upon the King's disposition, and was parallel to separations, less permanent because of surrounding conditions, that had taken place between the Papacy and other powers, such as France.

Although Henry for his own purposes might en-

courage heresy and was often glad to let agitation weaken the Church's influence, the changes of his reign were mainly in ecclesiastical relations and very little in doctrine. Under the Act of Supremacy **Thomas** Thomas Cromwell, an able adventurer, a **Cromwell** former soldier of fortune in Italy and money-lender in London, a useful servant to Wolsey, and a statesman of sordid ambitions, was made Vicar-General (1535), and as such wielded a large, tyrannous, and unscrupulous power over the Church. It was through him, if not due to him, that the Dissolution of **Disso-** Monasteries was carried through. The **lution of** smaller houses were dissolved (1536) by a **Monas-** process of visitation and surrender which **teries.** anticipated the Act. Their alleged evil condition was to be made an excuse for transferring their inmates to larger houses where religion was said to be well kept, but (1539) these larger houses soon followed their brethren. Much has been written lately as to the Dissolution, and it must be said that the evidence upon which the monasteries were condemned invites, and the agents who destroyed them compel, suspicions of the good faith of the Government. Altogether some 350 smaller and 200 larger houses were dissolved, some 5,000 and 3,000 persons respectively affected. There should have come to the King an income of some £200,000 a year, or a capital of some £4,800,000 in the currency of the day, and in modern value of ten times that amount at least. But so much was wasted to enrich courtiers and officials, the new nobility subservient to the Crown, that the results, little of which went to good purposes, were far below this sum. Six new bishoprics were created at West-

minster, Bristol, Chester, Gloucester, Peterborough, and Oxford, the first of which had only a short existence. The endowments of a few Professorships and much rearrangement of foundations earned the King a reputation greater than he deserved. He has been called "the founder of all that he left standing." A great revolution was wrought, and by the Suppression a richly illuminated page of medieval history was turned over almost for ever. The completeness of the process, which even the reaction under Mary could not reverse, left England with its monastic buildings destroyed and desecrated, while its parish churches stood often damaged but preserved. The suffering and discontent thus brought about were one cause of later rebellions such as the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), which were cruelly put down. The injury done by the Suppression to the higher interests of national life is hard to estimate. The monasteries had been the homes of much labour and skill that could not maintain themselves alone, and nowhere was the change more felt than at the Universities, where the number of students became sadly lessened. Education, society, agriculture, were dislocated, and the economic change (a third of the land in England may have changed ownership) led to uncertainty and a race, often unscrupulous, for wealth and power. The poor lost friends always kind if not always wise. The keen business methods of the new landlords, and a needed poor-law legislation, emphasised the change.

Henry's legislation in some respects remained unchanged in later times. The election of bishops by *congé d'élire* was no great change from medieval practice, and recognised a royal privilege of ancient

standing and claimed elsewhere. The removal of Papal Confirmation destroyed what had been sometimes a safety to the Church and sometimes an excuse for tyranny.

**Relations
to the
Papacy.**

The King's legislation and his correspondence show that he had not at first meant his breach with the Pope to be final, and indeed the legal renunciation was only completed in 1536. His chief object was the enforcement of his own will, and both the papal power and the independence of the English Church stood in the way of this. Gradually his breach with Rome became permanent; the weakness of the Papacy and the politics of the day made it easy for him to hold

a position which was theoretically anomalous. The new power, different in degree rather than in kind from that exercised

**Royal
Supremacy.**

in other lands, was as dangerous to civil as to religious liberty, and met with much dislike and some opposition, for the most part ruthlessly put down. It

also changed the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Church and State had hitherto worked so closely together that it had become difficult to discriminate between

**Powers
of the
Arch-
bishop.**

the secular and ecclesiastical position of the Archbishop, between his functions as leader of the Church and as chief adviser of the King. Moreover, there had arisen the same difficulty in separating his powers as *legatus natus* and as Archbishop. The suppression of the former office partly gave him a clearer field of insular authority, partly left him weaker as against the King. Both these features are easily seen in Cranmer's archiepiscopate (1533-1536).

It is difficult to judge fairly the character of Cranmer;

for there was in him so much of weakness and caution, Thomas Cranmer. so much of a mind open to temporary influences, along with so much of constructive power; of historic appreciation of the past with its organisation and liturgic riches, along with so much of literary sympathies with the newer national and popular spirit of the day, that the results of the combination are often contradictory. His disgraceful subserviency to the King in the matters of his divorce and later marriages may be set against the spiritual influence of his literary workmanship in the English Prayer-book and his caution in directing the Reformation. His views especially upon the Holy Eucharist may have changed from time to time under outside influences, but to him is due the conservatism of the English Reformation in its constitutional changes: and it should be remembered that his ideal of a reformed Church included both frequent synods and a working code of canon law (see *Reformatio Legum* and especially *De Concionatoribus*, cap. 5). Had his idea been carried out in these respects, the English Church might have regained more quickly its old self-government, and so recovered from the temporary paralysis of Henry's Supremacy much as the Parliament did from his civil tyranny. Elizabeth's changed style of Governor for Head, even if with a chance of retreat in an added *etc.*, her repudiation of any spiritual functions, and her care for the independence of the Church as against Parliament, were significant and influential, but even they did not make up for these grave defects which Cranmer had wished to supply. It is impossible here to separate the varied influences that moulded Cranmer. The earlier revival of learning was, as his own library shows, one

of the strongest. "Little Germany" and the White Horse at Cambridge (1523-1527) counted for something. At a later date German influences were strong. A mind so receptive as his along with a disposition so pliant, was naturally swayed by the tendencies both of current theology, in Germany as elsewhere, and of national thought.

In the later years of Henry's reign it is needful to bear in mind the course of affairs abroad, where clamour for a Council, the growing importance of Henry political and religious Lutheranism and VIII., Calvinism, of a demand for reform by even 1536-1547. cardinals themselves, and papal avoidance of a Council were the leading features.

Much controversy arose upon the King's position. Gardiner's celebrated *de Vera Obedientia* asserted strongly the complete authority of the King over "his English Church and Congregation" (to use the terms of the Articles). He there rated the *authority* of Rome highly, but he used the word "in the sense of Cicero," implying popular estimation rather than legal right. He even admits a Roman Primacy, but he goes to the Scriptures to define its nature, which is one of service and use, not of dominion or disrespect to others. A treatise on the same subject, more official although inferior in force, was Sampson's *de Vera Obedientia præstanda*, which drew forth Pole's well-known *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*. Pole's almost royal birth, his liberal and discursive education, his destination for high office (he is said to have refused the Archbishopric of York after Wolsey and before Lee), and his correspondence with the Spanish Court, made his views important. But his affirmative answer to the question whether

"the superiority which the Pope claimed for himself in many ages was of divine origin" checked his English career. He charged Henry with breaking the unity of the Church and with usurping spiritual functions. His support of these charges—condemned by Bishop Tunstal and others—made a breach between him and Henry. His creation as a cardinal (Dec. 22nd, 1536) launched him on a new, and now a definitely clerical career.

Three doctrinal documents of Henry's reign have great importance. The Ten Articles were the first of **Ten Articles of 1536.** many attempts to maintain, on a wide basis, the unity of the Church of England. Their composition was preceded by a command from the King to compose the disturbance of the realm and by much discussion between Cranmer and Stokesley, Bishop of London, mainly on the definition of Sacraments. The first five of the Articles included things necessary to salvation. The Creeds and Bible expounded according to the Doctors of the Church were the basis of faith. Opinions condemned by the Four Ecumenical Councils were to be rejected. The Sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist were left undefined. Baptism was declared to be necessary for everlasting life, and to be the remission of Original Sin. In adults, penitence and faith were conditions of baptism. Penance, with its three parts, contrition, confession (auricular confession being retained), and amendment, was declared necessary for the salvation of the baptised after deadly sin. The real and corporal presence of Christ under the form of the elements was asserted, although transubstantiation was not. Justification was defined as remission of sins and our re-

conciliation with God, that is, our perfect renewal in Christ, to be reached by contrition and faith working through charity. The other five Articles concerned laudable ceremonies of the Church. Images were to be retained, as were veneration of saints and prayers for their intercession, but superstitious abuses of these were to be avoided. Many popular ceremonies associated with special days were explained simply. Prayers for the dead were required, but the abuses connected with Purgatory (Masses, pardons, and so forth) were to be put away. The same year Cromwell issued for the King injunctions to the clergy, which differed slightly in their tone towards some of these ceremonies. Demands made in them upon the clergy for instruction and pecuniary help for scholars were meant to repair the ravages of the Dissolution. There is a ring about this document that suggests Spain or Bavaria rather than the England of the past—royal control is so much taken for granted and the path of clerical duty so emphatically shown. By these injunctions a **The Bible** copy of the Bible in Latin and English was to **in English** be placed in the choir of the churches. The **Churches.** order may have been ineffective, but it marks (as did the Ten Articles) a transitional stage. As yet there was a desire not to discard Latin, the language of medieval unity, but there was also an impulse towards a national Bible. The English Bible was, perhaps, even more closely bound up with the English Reformation than the German Bible with the German Reformation.

The two other documents also deserve mention. The Institution of a Christian man (1537)—a paraphrase and explanation at length of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments, the Sacraments and

the Hail Mary. With great literary power and with logical accuracy the Institution defines the position of the English Church much as it might be done to-day. It embodies the doctrinal parts of the Ten Articles, but the four lesser Sacraments are defined as being of less dignity and necessity than the others. Much of the exposition of them was indeed used in the later Book of Common Prayer and the Articles. The second work—the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian man (1543)—was largely a revision of its predecessor, and although it was even more the work of the bishops than the former book was, it has become known as the King's Book, in contrast to the older book's title of Bishops' Book. An article on faith was added. In the part on the Sacraments transubstantiation was affirmed. On the whole subject of Orders, with its divisions and ceremonies, the later book kept closer to tradition. Generally there was here sign of doctrinal reaction.

The same reaction was seen in the so-called Six Articles (1539): a reassertion, by parliamentary authority under royal impulse and after discussion in Convocation, of the older theology. Here again the advantages of unity were insisted upon. Transubstantiation, the non-necessity of Communion in both kinds, the celibacy of the priests, the obligation of monastic vows, the use of private Masses in the King's English Church and Congregation, auricular confession, were all asserted. Rigorous machinery for inquiry into heresies was made by the Statute, but harsh as its provisions

were, the use made of them was slight. The Statute really came from the King, and marked his repudiation of heresies and agitations he had sometimes encouraged but now found inconvenient. Controversies had arisen as to England's isolation, and her orthodoxy needed assertion. About the same time the old Service Books were being considered with a view to greater unity of use. A vernacular Prayer Book, following after the many English Primers or Manuals of Devotion (a notable instance of which was put forth in 1545, the close of a long medieval series), was both popular and desirable. A reissue of the Sarum Breviary (1541), which was ordered for sole use in the Southern Provinces, was a step towards unity. The public reading of a chapter in English upon Sundays and Holy-days, and the issue (1544) of the Litany in English (much as now) marked the extent of change. Various drafts of services were being considered when the King's death brought Edward VI. to the throne (Jan. 28th, 1547).

The reign of Henry had greatly changed the outside relations of the country, especially in Church matters, although probably the vigorous Bull of ex-communication (1535) composed by Paul III. was never published, and the tyranny of his later years had not commended the change. Even more was the country changed in itself and its appearance. The heavy hand of the King exercised a tyranny as complete in the Church as in the State, but in both cases the constitutional machinery remained. Some theologians, and especially Cranmer, had come under German influence, as yet of the Lutheran, not Zwinglian type. The King had sometimes talked of a political league with the German

**Results of
Henry's
reign.**

Protestants, but in its formularies and organisation alike the Church remained unaffected, save in a few lesser points upon which differences of opinion and practice were not peculiar to England. An extreme case among these was the destruction of shrines, beginning with that of St. Thomas of Canterbury (1538). The relics and the jewels were conveyed to the King's treasury, and images used superstitiously (a term admitting differences of definition) were removed. This, like the use of the familiar Latin, now beginning to be less understood and also rivalled by the vulgar tongue, was something that affected the multitude. While the more learned part of the country sympathised, some with the moderate reforms of Trent, others with the differing reforms of Germany, the bulk of the nation remained little affected by the doctrinal discussions of the outside world. But changes in devotion, uprooting venerable habits and local traditions, aroused an opposition not provoked hitherto by anti-papal legislation, and the new reign had to reckon not only with a growing national spirit, dissociated through Henry's selfish tyranny from loyalty to the Crown, but with tendencies even stronger and more dangerous. Doctrinal strife had gained intensity and was now reaching England. Martyrdoms on both sides had disgraced Henry's rule. Ecclesiastical changes had become bound up with private selfishness, and gentle families in England, as princely families in Germany, could make their market of religious differences. Statesmen wishing to copy Thomas Cromwell had a new career opened to them under an infant King, and the lower classes were to learn from experience that their religious habits and spiritual interests were to be

the sport of politicians. A time of social change and commercial growth is not the best for religious changes that are dangerous even if necessary.

The politics and alliances of Henry's reign had made it clear that England and Scotland were to form henceforth, as once before in the earlier Middle Ages, one almost independent system. Scotland. Scotland had, it was true, passed, by the formation of an independent province of St. Andrews (1472), under more direct papal control. But the Tudor policy aimed at bringing Scotland into closer touch with England, an aim which, at a later date, first French and then Spanish rivalry made even more to be desired. On the other hand, a feeling of Scots independence was aroused in opposition to England, and thus there was a battle of diplomacy. But the course of the Reformation movements in Scotland and in England became intertwined, and the smaller country, once under Elizabeth and again under Charles I., decisively influenced the larger.

In no country was the Church in a worse condition than in Scotland. The greater Church offices were the booty of kingly and noble families. Clerical efficiency and even morality were at the lowest ebb. The feudal treatment of the Church and its offices had lingered longer in Scotland than elsewhere, and the political constitution was more rudimentary than that of England. The parishes were pillaged for the abbeys, and the abbeys were pillaged for the nobles. Lollardy may have slightly affected the country from its English starting-place, but the Scots Church suffered not so much from energy misplaced as from a lack of energy at all. When Lutheranism rose its books reached Scotland,

and Patrick Hamilton (1528) was a martyr to his Lutheran creed. David Beaton, Cardinal and Archbishop of St. Andrews (1539), was a leader of the anti-English party, and the great upholder of the Church; but, like Wolsey, he belonged to politicians and statesmen rather than theologians or religious leaders. His execution (1546) of George Wishart, a Zwinglian layman who had travelled much and gathered congregations in Haddington and Forfar, who had attracted John Knox to himself, and seems to have been mixed in English intrigues, is an epoch in the Scots movement. Three months later Beaton himself was surprised and slain in his castle of St. Andrews. John Knox, who more than any other directed the movement, was a scholar of Wishart's, and acted as preacher to Cardinal Beaton's murderers at St. Andrews. The politics of religion and support of or opposition to English interference were henceforth closely intertwined.

It was unfortunate that the tender age of the new King marked him out as a plaything for politicians, and that he came to the throne **Edward VI.** when religious factions, within and without the land, were keenest. The personal piety of a boy was of small avail. His precocity and openness to outside influence made him easily led. His early training amid theological discussion and vagaries of tyranny increased the danger from his pliability. The Augsburg Interim (May, 1548), which drove many German ministers, Lutherans, and Calvinists from their homes, brought some of them to England. The reign of Edward, therefore, with its background of a Court and King ruled by ambitious and self-seeking

statesmen, was that in which foreign influence reached its height. Change was rapid and not controlled by regard for religious interests or national welfare. The reaction against ecclesiastical statesmen had lessened the possible power of the leading bishops. The robbery of the Church continued, especially under the Protector Somerset. The destruction of the chantries (with their provision for prayers for the dead, and often, incidentally, for village education) and the confiscation of the property of all guilds and religious societies brought the evils of rapacity and misrule more closely home to individuals. Education suffered, over two hundred grammar schools being swept away and but a few re-founded. The pillage of the enclosures and the debasement of the coinage; the selfishness of rulers, who depended upon mercenaries for their support—all these made a bad atmosphere for a constructive religious policy. As yet there was no outcry for the restoration of papal power, but a rule such as that of the Council was likely to create a demand for any possible alternative that seemed to promise stability. Force, that could not plead legality, and overshot the general conscience of the nation, was certain to cause a reaction.

In the Council marked differences appeared. There was a conservative party, the theological leader of which was Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester (1531 to Nov. 12th, 1555). But he and Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton and Lord Chancellor, were soon excluded from power and superseded. Gardiner, a learned man, who had risen by his diplomatic and political ability, had been a thorough-going supporter of Henry. He now deprecated changes in worship and dealings with doctrine until the King

**Parties
in the
Council.**

should come of age. In regard to the Holy Eucharist he upheld transubstantiation, and he had not been prepared to accept changes in view insinuated in the Bibles published (by private enterprise, although with later royal approval) under Henry. He now took his stand upon "the Pacification" intended by Henry. He opposed changes, symbolised by the removal of "unabused" images in favour of the royal arms, or accompanied by mutilation of images here and there, by violent sermons and changes that ran ahead of law. Cranmer's sermon at the Convocation, which greatly magnified the office of the King; far-reaching words of Henry's executors now in charge of the realm; the publication of the First Book of Homilies, prepared by Cranmer as early as 1543, but only now issued by the Council; the Injunctions (July, 1547), which, when enlarged by decree (Sept.), did away with all images and shrines and Litany in processions—all these things heralded greater change, opposition to which landed Bishops Bonner and Gardiner in the Fleet. Parliament, which met in November, passed an Act against ridicule of and disputation in the Sacrament, to which was added an order for Communion in both kinds. Other Acts did away with the *congé d'élire* in the election of bishops, made the bishops' courts directly depend upon the Crown, and gave to the King all chantries not yet dissolved.

The history of Convocation is a troubled one. The Bill of Communion in both kinds had been added to a
Convoca- Bill against ridicule of the Sacrament, and
tion. after passing the Commons, gained the unanimous consent (verbal, not as usual, written) of Convocation. The Southern Lower House petitioned that

Convocation should have its proper share in the legislation about religion and the Church, and also began to move for a revision of services and the fulfilment of the Commission of 1532 for a code of canon law. And lastly, they decided for clerical marriage, a Bill for which was passed in 1549. Thus Convocation, while chafing at its loss of power, which was only regarded as temporary, showed itself inclined to changes of the kind favoured not only by Lutherans, but also by Catholics in Germany and France.

But the ritual change which was to end in making the Anglican Use the type of a new family went on. The adoption of Communion in both kinds necessitated a change in the Holy Eucharist. The old form was left in Latin, but a Communion for the people in English was added for Eastertide, 1548, and further changes were under consideration. Some ceremonies—such as the blessing of palms, creeping to the cross, carrying of candles at Candlemas, and ashes on Ash Wednesday—were forbidden. Cranmer's own draft of a service book—influenced largely by the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon—was again brought up for discussion; so too was the Rationale—the explanation of Anglican ceremonies prepared by the Commission of 1540, and since then laid aside. The publication of a Communion was necessary, and the choice of English was a concession to the growing love of the vernacular. The enlarged use of epistles and gospels and daily chapters in English had been a move in the same direction, and was intended for the positive instruction on which the Reformation, like the Middle Ages, laid much stress. But the issue of the first Prayer Book (1549) went further. In its conception it was

reverent and conservative. It bore traces of the Consultation of Hermann of Wied (Bishop of Köln), and of the Breviary of Quignon, but, in the main, was a revision of the old English Service Books. The use of the Breviary of Quignon has been described as almost "irenical" in its intention, for that Breviary was favoured by the Pope and largely used among Continental Catholics. The existence of parallel revisions abroad, papal and Lutheran alike, is significant of the need of such a work. The attempt to secure unity in the realm was meant for "pacification," and the measure of its success affects our estimate of the wisdom of the attempt. Whether Convocation was consulted upon the Prayer Book or not has been greatly discussed; the loss of its records and the balance of opposite inferences from existing evidence perplex the verdict. It is certain the bishops had been consulted upon the doctrinal questions. Something that might be taken for approval had been gained from them, although Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, denied before the House of Lords that they had done more than consider it in disputation. But even had Convocation been free to use all its theoretical powers of self-government, the *jus liturgicum* lay not with it, but with the bishops. The questions presented to them for decision show that as large a basis of unity was desired as possible in making a new departure.

The first Act of Uniformity (Jan. 21st, 1549), which enforced the use of the Prayer Book, was an emphatic enlargement of Henry's policy of uniformity. However desirable in the interests of peace such uniformity might be, the change of usages and language—especially when accompanied by

**Act of Uni-
formity,
1549.**

the removal of images and the active interference of the Council—was unpopular. Rebellion—partly due to these religious changes and partly due to social and economic causes—increased the difficulties of the unscrupulous leaders. Their manipulation of doctrinal disputes, like their indulgence in greed and plunder, recalled the worst days of Henry VIII. The fall of Somerset (Oct., 1549) only increased the uncertainty and intensified the evils of the nation, for his successors were worse copies of the same bad type.

The bishops found their authority interfered with by the State and despised by the multitude. Foreign theologians gained more influence, and the wish to reform the English Church after "the model of the best reformed Churches abroad" began to appear. Bishop Ridley's visitation of London, where he had irregularly replaced Bonner (May, 1550), marked a new tendency. He ordered the removal of altars and the erection of tables, and otherwise outstepped the limit of legal change. The objection of Hooper—chosen as Bishop of Gloucester (April, 1550)—to the episcopal vestments, retained in the ordinal when various ceremonies were left out, was an indication of future and growing troubles as to vestments. The Prayer Book had to reckon with those who preserved within its limits as much of the old customs as possible, and with those who moved as far towards Calvinistic worship as possible. It was impossible then, as now, for a book to be a complete directory of worship, and much was left, even within the limits of uniformity, to personal taste. In these circumstances, foreign and unsympathetic criticisms prepared the way for the second Prayer Book. This book, authorised by Parliament (April

14th, 1552), was to be used on November 1st, 1552. Change here reached its limit. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the differences of the two books, but the part played by John Knox—now a licensed preacher in England—in gaining the addition of the so-called Black Rubric deserves notice. Knox objected to kneeling for the reception of the elements, and gained the Council to his view. Cranmer, whose pliancy has been often overstated, protested, but the Council added the Rubric on kneeling, which was afterwards omitted under Elizabeth (1559), and restored with a verbal but vital alteration in 1662. The death of Edward (July 6th, 1553) found this Prayer Book hardly in use, while uniformity had been nowise reached. The fact that the new book had declared the old "agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church" gave a safe footing to those who preferred the old, and the reaction under Mary restored the conservative party who had, up to now, been overborne where not imprisoned.

The political schemes of Edward's Council came to naught, and Mary's succession at once removed the Mary, Council's claimant from the throne. Wyatt's 1553-1558. rebellion (1554) led to severity against some of the leaders and the flight of others. Political discredit discounted their religious views. The Queen's religious preferences were well known, and made her accession more popular. The laws passed in Edward's reign concerning religion were repealed in the first Parliament (1553), and thus at once a large step backwards was taken. But it is evident that the new Queen at first meant to be tolerant, and in justice to her it should be remembered that the attacks upon her by the Protestants in exile passed all bounds.

Wyatt's rebellion was a political turning-point in her treatment of the opposition.

The Emperor, whom Mary consulted from the first, advised caution and mildness to begin with, but after this rebellion he thought her timid in punishment, and he even suspected Gardiner, now in power as Chancellor, of treacherous advice. Julius III. had made a natural choice in appointing Cardinal Pole legate for the reconciliation of England (Aug., 1553), but neither Pope nor legate quite understood the temper of the realm. There was, as Mary confessed, much opposition to "the re-entry of papistry." Parliament clearly distinguished between the religious changes it approved and the papal restoration it disliked; and the regaining of the monastic lands proved an impossible step to take. Pole's reception was long delayed, and when at last he came (Nov., 1554), it was as ambassador, not as legate. All statutes against papal authority passed since 1528 were repealed, and the country was formally reconciled. But the process had been irregular, and the counter-revolution, like the revolution itself, had disregarded proper forms. The Council and Parliament had anticipated the papal authority and acted of themselves.

Before this had been done Mary's marriage with Philip of Spain had marked a new English policy, and brought much odium upon the English Court. It was, however, so necessary for Spain to gain the help of England that nothing of the Spanish rigour against heresy was carried out or even recommended in England by Philip or his attendants. But things moved towards the persecution that stamped the reign. Cranmer and other bishops had been thrown into prison (Sept. to Oct., 1553), and the bishops formerly displaced

by them restored. Apart from these cases the rate of episcopal change from natural causes was heavy throughout the reign. The married clergy were also deprived or allowed to part from their wives. Shortly before the repeal of the anti-papal laws, the statutes against Lollardy were revived, although not without some opposition. But the mild treatment of the prisoners for religion did not continue. Gardiner, in a sermon at S. Paul's, had declared he himself was sorry for what he had done under Henry, and that through the heresies that had arisen he was driven to alter his stand, and support the papal power. But he was not a persecutor by disposition, and the worst of the persecution only began after his death (Nov., 1555). The martyrs were mainly either bishops or men of lowly rank. Some of them faced death for the private interpretation of Scripture; others for the Common Prayer Book or the principles it embodied. The tragedy of Cranmer, however, raised a different principle—the papal authority. It is true that a belief in transubstantiation might possibly have saved his life. So far he was revolutionary, but his doctrinal attitude, on the other hand, was, perhaps, most strongly given by his practice and almost dying words recommending confession as good. Isolated points did not count for much. In the course of his trial, his weakness, no less than his inner fibre of consistency, was shown with dramatic force, and in the end he died rather for a system he had helped to form than for any single point (1556). Cardinal Pole succeeded him as archbishop. Upon him and the poor Queen, saddened by her life as an oppressed maiden and a neglected wife, the guilt of persecution must rest. The Marian

persecution was neither unique nor without palliation. Seditious language and heresy—regarded by all sides as a crime—could not be redeemed by morality or sincerity. But the persecution wrought a change in English opinion which nothing else could have done. The death of the Queen and of Pole on the same day (Nov. 17th, 1558) gave a chance for a natural change. The policy by which Paul IV. opposed Philip and had revoked Pole's commission was a curious comment upon the reconciliation of the realm. The first meetings at Trent had fallen in the reign of Edward, and England had then naturally stood aloof. Paul IV., however, made a close union between England, even under Mary, and Rome unlikely. But Pole had, even so, already had a great opportunity of shaping a Church in accordance with his best ideas. A Synod met (Dec., 1555), and a large programme was laid before it: a newly translated New Testament, new Homilies, a completed code of canon law, a wide reform of abuses. The twelve constitutions presented to it were meant to rival those of Ottoboni, and dealt with many abuses afterwards reformed at Trent—the duties of bishops as to preaching; non-residence; reform of chapters; avoidance of luxury; due care in ordinations; diocesan seminaries, and so forth. The reforming movement begun by Convocation in 1532 was thus to be revived. Unhappily, however, Pole's labours were mainly literary. He extended a glorified copy of the proposed constitutions for the eye of the Pope in his *Reformatio Angliæ*, but the Synod itself was put off again and again until in the end nothing came of it. Hence once more Pole thus showed an excellence of intention joined to weakness of execution.

Elizabeth, on her accession, found an England differently disposed in Church matters from what Mary had **Elizabeth**, found. Of the new Queen's popularity there **1558-1603**. was no doubt, and it was generally expected that her ecclesiastical policy would be like that of her father. The dread of Spain was upon the land, and the dislike felt for that dominant power was both religious and national. The name of Spain was bound up with opposition to change even in milder forms than heresy, and with the repressive policy of the Inquisition. Spain was blamed, though unjustly, for the persecution under Mary, and Spain was the rival of England in the naval and commercial age that was beginning. Elizabeth and her statesmen (especially Cecil) felt that the one thing needed was to carry a united nation along with her in what was to be done. It was to be clear that she stood for England, through peace if possible, but if necessary, against the Papacy and Spain. It was to be clear that she wished to conciliate all Church parties, but that she would not risk peace to conciliate the most extreme. Caution and diplomacy, carried even to dissimulation and cunning, were to mark her policy, and its aim was to be comprehensive. Too much is sometimes made of the phrase "the Elizabethan settlement." In details much was changed at a later date, and the true permanent settlement belongs to 1662; but the spirit which has on the whole since then marked the English Church inspired the policy of the Elizabethan leaders, slowly as their policy shaped itself. And as regards the outside powers the significance of the date of her accession must be noted. The Tridentine settlement was not yet completed; it was therefore possible to cherish

hopes of a full reunion. Meanwhile France and Spain might be played off against each other, and England was of so much importance that nothing rash was likely to be done against her; indeed, so late as June, 1563, the Fathers at Trent hesitated from policy to condemn Elizabeth, although urged to do so by the theologians of Louvain.

Thus circumstances favoured a somewhat tentative policy, the broad lines of which were laid down, although the details were open to variation. Elizabeth's But the papal policy did not drive Eliza- policy. beth and her advisers into opposition to Rome. That they intended from the first. As external success met that policy, it grew bolder; but it became more evident from the action of the Pope upon his English followers, on the one hand, and from the deeds of the reformers upon the other, that complete success in the full union of a compacted realm could not be reached. It is clear, from the tight hand kept upon the preachers and innovations, and from the records of discussions upon important points, that the Crown meant to lay down the religious policy of the country as a whole. Alterations adverse to "the Pope's religion" were to be made, but on the other hand, small regard was paid to the extreme reformers. Moderation, uniformity, and a dexterous use of politics were first to found and then to defend a religious edifice. The composition of a "book" was to be the chief of the means chosen. The plunder of the Church for the State was, although with less intensity than under Henry or Edward, to continue, and did so until James I., to his credit, stopped it. The Queen's supreme power was to be rigorously used, but within these limits the right of

the Church to its self-government in its own assemblies was carefully guarded. It was significant that the title of Supreme Governor took the place of Supreme Head. It was unfortunate that episcopal authority—upon which large calls were to be made—was not popular, and that its efficiency had been interfered with, both by the Crown under Henry and Edward, and by the Papacy and legatine influence under Mary. Nothing is more notable than the way in which this authority recovered itself, although its assertion of its rights was to cause strife, and even warfare. Strangely enough, no less than ten sees were vacant by death in Elizabeth's first year. Her choice of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury was wise. He had the needed learning, he was likely to command the sympathy of reformers, and his moderation was undoubted. In his case, however, moderation did not spring from timidity or uncertain views, but from personal conviction. Great care was taken to secure the episcopal succession. In the appointment of bishops the usage of Henry's reign was restored; viz. election under *congé d'élire*, confirmation by the archbishop and consecration. But revolutions had left legal uncertainties, and so in Parker's case the Queen, by a special clause in the Letters Patent for his confirmation, "supplied all defects"; so the needs of the civil law were satisfied, and every care was taken to comply with ecclesiastical law upon the other hand.

When the exiles returned from Germany and Switzerland, they brought with them views other than those they had held on leaving England. The importance of "the troubles at

Frankfort" (1554-7), a double dispute, firstly on the question of using during exile the English Prayer Book, and secondly on the question of discipline, cannot be overlooked. For these incidents marked a division between those who wished to reform the Church of England on a Calvinist model and those who (like Parker) preferred a Catholic and yet national line of their own. It was the former group that caused the earliest difficulties of Elizabeth and Parker. They only accepted—if their partial use were an acceptance—the settlement in the hope of further change in their direction. The views of the rulers were different. The Prayer Book of 1559 was based upon the Second Book of Edward. In combining the words of administration at the Communion from the two books of Edward it attempted an inclusive form which definitely excluded for their sacramental views only those to whom the Sacrament was a mere symbol. By its Ornaments Rubric ordering the vestments which were in use in the second year of Edward it indicated the type of service chosen. The preservation of episcopacy (upon which only the exigencies of controversy have thrown an utterly unfounded doubt) and the provision of Canons (1571) kept continuity with the older days. Thus the dangers to which the Church had been exposed under Edward seemed now passed. But it proved hard to secure uniformity from the exiles. So difficult was it to enforce the vestments that the Advertisements of 1566 allowed the use of the surplice as a minimum. The Queen did not care for the advertisements; the bishops regarded them as temporary, and a step towards general obedience to the Rubric. The opinion of the foreign divines was

quoted against the Prayer Book, and the deliberate policy of the bishops was for the time to keep one standard of ritual in theory and to enforce a lower in practice. But Parker's attempts at enforcing obedience and discipline—in which he was but badly supported by some of his colleagues, and often thwarted by the puritanically disposed statesmen—were suddenly checked by a more important controversy, one that questioned the whole ecclesiastical constitution. But before this arose, the Thirty-Nine Articles, reduced, with some changes, from the Forty-Two of Edward, had been adopted by Convocation and published by the Queen's Council. Save for a slight revision in 1571, they were much as they now stand. No like document has remained so long practically unaltered. Their genuinely comprehensive character, with their boldness of assertion against the decrees of Trent and the doctrines of the Puritans on opposite sides, deserved this fate.

The apparent success of the Advertisements only led to a keener strife. The extreme faction fell back upon the position that everything done in the Church must have Biblical support. This principle, easily disproved later on by Hooker, was used to express their real dislike of ceremonies, and to justify their non-conformity. That no "rags of Popery" were to be kept was a feeling equally intense and fruitful in results. A definite doctrinal position was thus reached, and while on the one hand separated religious bodies appeared (1567), on the other hand academic Presbyterianism, especially at Cambridge, where Cartwright, a leader of some learning and far-reaching influence,

taught, took a peculiarly English form. It was not so complete an organisation as Scotland showed, for there Genevan principles, hitherto worked out in a large city, took a larger form, suited to a land which lay at their disposal. Scots Presbyterianism is thus the most developed type of its class. The same principles on French soil had developed and emphasised the synod, but Scotland added to the French model a complete system of tribunals. In England, however, possibly owing to the strain of episcopal authority, Presbyterianism turned itself into an attack upon Episcopacy as an evil and anti-Biblical system, while the need of a popular call to the ministry was insisted upon. Its doctrinal side was thus strongly developed. But the sacerdotal spirit of the Presbyters was as strongly marked in England as it was in Scotland. Side by side with the existing Anglican organisation a Presbyterian system was thus formed; the prophesyings or preachings were something that came to the surface, but the organisation of "classes" was more important, although deeper down. It was this attempt to Presbyterianise England which Archbishop Whitgift (1583-1604) suppressed with full success; for the Presbyterianism appearing under Charles I. was a new introduction, a Scottish and not an English growth. But it is important to notice tendencies of thought as well as schemes of organisation, and there remained in England a widespread tendency to refer to the Bible, and to it alone, for authority. This tendency existed inside the Church among many of its members, while outside it Congregational bodies and Baptist bodies were formed with the same conviction. A uniformity

**Varieties
of Presby-
terianism.**

which concealed underlying diversity was thus to a large extent reached inside the Church, but with the result of leaving separated bodies outside it. The problem of religious liberty was thus forced into a new stage; not looseness of thought or organisation within the Church, but toleration for differing sects was to be the outcome. But it was long before the sects, who would have preferred their own supremacy, saw the necessity of this solution.

Religious change in Scotland had also quickened its pace. Protestant opinions had been spreading, and on the other hand some attempts at improved discipline and instruction had been made; but the conditions were unwholesome and the reforms were slight. John Knox returned (1555) to find a Scotland in which Catholicism was bound up with subserviency to France. Two years later the First Covenant was signed, and the leading nobles began to look to England for help. The Parliament (1562) adopted a Calvinist Confession, prohibited the Mass, made a call from the congregation an essential for the ministry, and did away with both papal and episcopal jurisdiction. Under a book of discipline a system was afterwards organised for the whole country, and when this was completed (1592),

Presby- Scotland was devoted to the doctrine of
terianism the divine right of Presbytery, to a govern-
in Scotland. ment by ministers and elders. But before this came about, Mary of Scots had ended her stormy and sad career. The result, a closer union between the two countries, was now certain. It simplified their politics and embarrassed their religion. The English speculations of Cartwright and his followers produced in Scotland an organisation, while in its own home it

remained a mere tendency of thought. During the Civil War this Scots Presbyterianism was imported into England, but the original English Presbyterianism died out, and indeed it was, perhaps, of too academic a nature to flourish everywhere. But when the English Parliament during the Civil War needed help from Scotland, they pledged themselves to the introduction of Presbyterianism, with the result that the nation, impatient of the old ecclesiastical courts, was soon equally impatient of the new clerical jurisdiction. But much turned upon the Scots' dislike of Episcopacy. James I. had tried to maintain titular bishops, who had slight authority and were little more than representatives of the Church in Parliament. He had an archbishop and two bishops consecrated (1610), for Scotland in England. But James's real struggle in Scotland had been to resist the claim of Scotland. National Assembly and Presbyters to control the State, and in this resistance he had, at first, the majority of the nobles and gentry upon his side. When he went further, however, and tried to interfere with the existing worship, trouble began. It was possible, by violence or by skill, to manage the General Assembly, and its approval was gained for the preparation of a new Liturgy (1616), which proved abortive. But the Five Articles (1616) were another thing. By these James proposed to introduce the great festivals, Confirmation, kneeling at the Holy Communion, Communion for the sick, and private Baptism. These were accepted by a majority of the Assembly, and confirmed by Parliament (1621), but the opposition was stubborn and continued. The attempt intensified the existing dislike of royal interference. The national

sympathy, which had been veering round to Episcopacy as against Presbyterianism, was alienated by the royal policy. The plan of a new Prayer Book was revived under Charles I. (1629), but the suggested
1629-1633. introduction of the English book was unpopular, and (1633) the matter was postponed. Meanwhile, bishops of a higher ecclesiastical tone were chosen, and (1635) a new Prayer Book, modelled upon the English book of 1549, and Canons were drafted. The former was, without reason, objected to as popish. The latter were disliked as exalting bishops and instituting diocesan synods, and directing ritual changes already enforced in England (1637). But the main point was that through the old unwise policy the Book and the Canons were forced upon the Scots by royal authority. In the tumult that arose power passed from the King to the nation, and Scots Presbyterianism was bound up with the cause of national liberty. The political organisation of Scotland was weak, and the ecclesiastical organisation made up for this lack by the strength it possessed. Whatever might be the merits or defects of Scots Presbyterianism, it was national throughout, a position forced upon it by the Crown. The Episcopacy, which was defended by the Stewarts, represented the earlier reforming tendencies. It was, however, discredited by its association with absolute monarchy, and it also ran counter to the growing Calvinism of the Scots. The Catholics who kept to the papal obedience formed a large minority, and tradition, which, to some slight degree, was in their favour, made up to them for the loss of national sympathy, which turned more and more to Presbyterianism. The course of politics—which lie outside

our period—added strength to this clerical and yet democratic Calvinism.

Meanwhile the guidance of the English Catholics from Rome, and the growing boldness of the English Government, raised difficulties on the side **The** remote from Puritanism. Elizabeth's first **Papacy and** attempt at ecclesiastical rule had been an **Elizabeth.**

"Interim," and like all such attempts, was to depend upon the conciliatory dispositions of parties and the power of the Crown. Bound as they were under fine to attend their parish churches, the English Catholics who clung to the Papacy would have liked to keep their peace with the authorities at home, and yet maintain their separation. But the dread of Spanish influence, the certain existence of internal plots connected with religion, and the effect of the Tridentine reformation made their position harder. Acts of growing stringency were passed against them, and the agitation which centred around Mary of Scots intensified the bitterness of religious feeling. The question was asked at Rome of the authorities whether consent could not be gained to the attendance of English people at Matins and Evensong, although not at Communion. Obviously those who asked hoped to gain permission, but (Oct., 1562) the answer was not what they expected. The strange process against Elizabeth at Rome, and her excommunication and deposition by the Bull *Regnans in excelsis* (Feb. 25th, 1570), seemed to put before English Roman Catholics a choice of loyalty to Queen or obedience to Pope. The severe persecutions carried on by the Government—even the imprisonment of the Marian bishops was said by some to have been harsh—took advantage of their

dilemma. The foundation of the English College at Douai (1568), and the similar College at Rome (1576), increased the differences of view between the English Catholics of the Roman obedience and their spiritual leaders abroad. In 1574 the first batch of priests left Douai for England, and from that time onwards the unhappy stories of worship forbidden but carried on with devotion, of priests bearing their lives in their hands because accused, and often with reason, of conspiracies, became more common. The troubles at Wisbech (already mentioned, page 284) showed divisions of opinion among the priests of the Recusants, between the Seculars and Jesuits. The more English party did not like the energy and the political restlessness of the new school. But now and again, as at the time of the Armada, and when Charles I. raised his standard, the Roman Catholic gentry showed that loyalty which English law made difficult, and the papal bull made irreligious for them.

The primacy of Grindal (1576-1583), with the rise of the "propheysings" disliked by the Queen, but approved by him, furthered the spread of Genevan doctrines, and encouraged the underground Presbyterian organisations. The Council drew his attention (1579) to the distinction drawn between "preaching" and "ministering" clergymen, and to the designation of some as "no-sacrament" ministers, neglecting the sacraments. In consequence of all this, his successor found a hard task awaiting him. After Whitgift's stern repression of these organisations and his enforcement of discipline this doctrinal influence grew even stronger. Calvin's Institutes was the text-book at Oxford, and

Cambridge was even more Calvinistic in tone. So decided was this tendency, that the Lambeth Articles (1595), meant by Whitgift as a compromise between the views of the Articles and the prevalent opinions, seem in these days to be extreme. A dispute as to final perseverance had arisen at Cambridge, and these Articles, happily never sanctioned, are Whitgift's modification in the interests of peace of a suggested strongly Calvinistic statement. But a school was arising which was both to depart from Calvinism and to claim for the episcopate its proper historic place. It was the work of Hooker to lay in majestic English a new foundation of Anglican theology, giving to reason its full authority, and yet attaching due weight to scripture, tradition, and patristic teaching. This was one element in the Anglican system. Bancroft, first at London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury (1604-1611), partly by a return to older doctrine, partly as a reaction against the depreciation of Episcopacy, insisted upon the importance of the historic episcopate, and this made another element. This view agreed well with that held by James I., whose treatment of the so-called "Millenary" Petition showed his personal convictions. An Arminian reaction set in, especially at Oxford, where Laud, before he began his career as a restorer of ancient discipline, and the realiser in practice of the Prayer Book ideal, had attacked the prevalent Calvinism. Both departments of his activity—his enforcement of discipline and order, his repudiation of Calvinism—brought him up against strongly fixed opinions. Those who had neglected

**Reaction
against
Calvinism.**

**Laud,
Arch-
bishop,
1633-1645.**

order, and those who taught Calvinism, hated his conception of the Church, shadowed in the Prayer Book as it was, partly because it contradicted their views, partly because its realisation made for ever impossible that Calvinist system to which they had long hoped to bring the English Church. When four English Churchmen were sent by James I. to the Dutch Synod of Dort (Dordrecht) in 1619, they found their outlook very different from that of their hosts. The small result from their visit marked the decay of Calvinism in England, and the disappearance of any ground for hopes of joining the English Church "with the best reformed bodies" abroad. But Laud, innovator though he seemed to many in his own age, was really recurring to a type of Churchman common in the days before Edward VI. He represented, in his controversies with Papists and Puritans alike, the course the English Reformation might have run steadily and throughout, but for foreign and temporary influences. He has often been blamed for his want of sympathy and for some narrowness in his aims, but this lack and this limitation sprang from his central idea of discipline. Training himself by a system, he also enforced, often with a rigour that was fatal to his ends, this discipline upon others. But he did not only represent these earlier tendencies of thought. He further represented, among the Anglican Catholics of England, the movement of reform which the Roman Church had wrought out for itself at Trent. It was, however, the misfortune of the English Church that the course of English politics, the pressure of the Royal Supremacy, and the force of Puritanism prevented its realising for itself, and in a connected whole, a reform of its system com-

parable to that of Trent. It was wonderful, under the circumstances, how abuses such as the holding of ecclesiastical offices by laymen, or by those not yet in Holy Orders, simony, and so forth, gradually disappeared. But the Church suffered much and long from the fact that this process was piecemeal and desultory, instead of considered and complete. The Canons passed by Convocation in 1640 were Laud's beginning of an attempt at such a legislative reform; they showed his ideal and put the keystone upon his system. But they overshot the national inclination, and their formation was one of the charges that led to his martyrdom.

Ireland was a complicated problem, with its small English pale, its fringe of denationalised English, and its larger Celtic population. Government had been weak, civilisation backward, and religion, as was natural, at a low ebb, even before the shock of the Reformation made things worse. The Tudor policy was to make the country follow England, but it was easy for disloyalty or racial enthusiasm (as the same thing might be variously called) to seize upon the Pope's cause as an excuse for what it did. Hitherto Crown and Pope had worked together against the Irish; now they were opposed. In defence, Henry VIII. hit upon the plan of bribing by grants of land Irish chieftains to support his policy, religious and secular. In succeeding reigns changes of policy intensified discontent. Under Elizabeth the Irish Parliament passed Acts changing things as had been done in England. Most of the Marian bishops lived on in their offices as before: only two out of twenty-six were deprived for refusing the Oath of Supremacy.

But the Act ordering the use of the English Prayer Book (1560) began the severance of the Church from the people, and the appointment of bishops directly by the Crown (as in some Continental countries), though of course those appointed received valid consecration, increased royal influence overmuch. Successive settlements of Scots and English brought in fresh elements, and when the Restoration came, it found a country in which the Roman Catholic cause had grown, by its own wisdom and the mistakes of others, into a close union with Irish feeling. The rise of Puritanism had added bitterness to theological strife, and both the Civil War and the Irish rebellion (1641) left incurable wounds upon the land. Neither the country itself, nor the Church system which England proposed to support, had been given a fair chance of vigorous life. With a rule from England, fitful and intolerant, and mainly exercised in the interests of a minority, it was easy for the Counter Reformation, working with the elements at its hand, to build up, in spite of the great names of some Anglican bishops in Ireland, a hierarchy under Roman obedience that not only led but raised the people. The work of the body so built up has often added to the political evils of distressed Ireland, but it has also given to her a real religious enthusiasm and strong, effective, moral guidance.

The causes and the progress of the Civil War do not call for discussion here, but what has been said upon **The Civil War.** Laud's ideal, cherished by Charles I., as well as by himself, explains some antagonism between the King and the nation. It had been an evil result of her position, for which, perhaps, the

recent history of the Church was more responsible than Laud himself, that Laud, intent upon realising his ideal, should have leaned so greatly upon the royal power. In the end he who had taken the sword of the State perished by it. Dark days came upon the Church. The triumph of the Independents showed that religious toleration had been further from their thoughts than religious supremacy. The Parliament, which had always longed to settle not only Church organisation, but doctrine, also gained its wish, and completely revolutionised the religious and ecclesiastical life of England. For a time the needs of the war made it buy the help of Scotland at the cost of setting up a Presbyterianism it did not like or even believe in. But the enforcement of it was never thorough, and was in no way permanent. At length an Independent Congregationalism, slightly modified through a uniting pressure by the State, was set up (1653-1654), and not only the learning, but the devotion of England, seemed lost in the days when its Church was dismantled and its worship made penal. A religious tyranny, that considered itself tolerant because it was merely indefinite in its thought, shut out Anglican and papist from the protection of the law. But in the end the disturbed state of religion was one of the causes that led to the Royal Restoration, and with the King the Church returned.

The time of her suppression had left a mark behind it upon the Church, although her orders and her succession remained. A generation that had not known baptism had grown up, and a form of adult baptism had to be added to the Prayer Book. The discontinuity of religious life had left gaps even more im-

portant than the loss of traditions which had long supplied the place of Rubrics. But there was now no real question as to what model of a church should be restored. It was brought back as Laud's vision had seen her, one with the past not only in her unbroken descent, but in the devotion that was inspired by her altars and breathed in her prayers. Before her persecution she had attracted not a few foreigners like Adrian Saravia, and Isaac Casaubon, who felt the force of her appeal to antiquity as against both Geneva and Rome. Sacred learning was a necessity of her life which she could not forget, and in the men of her restoration, Andrewes, Ken, Jeremy Taylor, and their not unworthy fellows, she realised a type of Churchman not possible for her at the Reformation. Their manuals of devotion were the richest fruits of the age; some, like Laud's own prayers, were not meant to see the light. The existence of the souls and the minds which produced them was not possible among those who looked on the past with horror and dislike. She still bore the scars of her struggle. There were still some who leant overmuch upon the State, and the State had somewhat forgotten the limits of its power. There was still a strong current of Puritanism flowing beneath the surface, but suffering and exile had deepened the reformation which Laud's stringent discipline had begun. There was still much of intolerance left, but it showed itself more in the State than in the Church, and in the end England, which had been taught much by its constitutional life, solved the problem of religious toleration earlier and better than did other lands. That this was possible was due partly to the peculiar

course of the religious wars in England, and partly to the close connection of the Church with the national life. If the Church suffered often and heavily from the limitations placed upon her, she learnt something at least from them too. In later days she was to find out the value of having kept—what might have been so easily lost—a wide sympathy with varied currents of thought, and above all, a national coherence and independence for her episcopate: the union of these advantages with the carefully guarded validity of her orders, which so many other countries sacrificed, gave her a unique position and a many-sided future. The breach which she had to face was, as her formularies proved, and her later history was to show, a breach with the papal Catholicism of Trent, but not a breach with the Catholicism of earlier medieval days, still less with the Church of the Fathers.

Unique
position
of the
English
Church.

CHAPTER XIII

THE NETHERLANDS: FRANCE THE JESUITS

THE religious, like the political, history of the Netherlands was peculiar. Their political unity was dynastic, not national or local. Their ecclesiastical organisation was weak. The bulk of their territory lay in the three dioceses of Tournai (captured in 1521), Arras, and Utrecht (the temporal lordship of which was surrendered to Charles V. in 1527), but part also in Terouenne, Cambrai (captured in 1543), and Liège. As the controlling archbishops also belonged to foreign countries no organisation could well be more confused, and it was impossible for religious coherence to exist. Charles V. had again and again urged upon the Papacy the formation of new sees, for the existing organisation worked against the unity which he desired. But when Philip II. (1557) proposed to found, and also endow out of monastic funds, fourteen new sees with three archbishoprics, the scheme aroused great opposition because it was supposed to be in the interests of Spain. But the Netherlands had also had a peculiar history in regard to tendencies of thought. Nowhere had the revival of learning had more effect than in the region of the Brethren

of the Common Life, but their sound religious influence had been counter-balanced by that of more fantastic and mystic theologians or heretics, among whom the medieval Kathari (*c.* 1162), the Beguines and Beghards and the Lollards (*c.* 1300) were numbered. Some of these bodies combined excellent practical impulses with teaching opposed to that of the Church. In districts where the dioceses were too large for oversight and lines of trade brought wandering teachers, these vague popular movements soon degenerated, a process which was greatly hastened by the influence of the spiritual Franciscans. It was not surprising then that in the Netherlands Anabaptist teaching found a ready soil; Luther's writings soon became popular in the cities, and there as elsewhere strengthened underground currents of revolutionary thought; the Augustinians, who were locally strong, naturally favoured his views. But before long Zwinglian and Calvinistic tendencies gained the upper hand. It was from a Dutch theologian, van Hoen, that Zwingli first took his sacramental views, and the nearness of France made Calvinist influence stronger than Lutheran; incidentally, too, this school of thought was more suited to rich and democratic towns. When the Anabaptist movement was ended two classes of religious communities were found in existence. Firstly, a number of "quieter" Anabaptist bodies somewhat akin to the English Friends and organised (especially in Friesland) by Menno Simonis (*c.* 1542) as a select people and separated from the world. Secondly, a number of Calvinist bodies spreading from the Walloon provinces (the lands of Hainault, Artois, and Namur) northwards to the German

districts. It was with these that the future of the country lay.

Charles V. was not hampered in the Netherlands by the political conditions which thwarted his will in **Charles V.** Germany, and determined to put down **and his** Protestantism with a heavy hand. The **rule.**

Inquisition was organised as a department of the State (April, 1522), and a layman, Francis van der Hulst, was placed at its head. The Edict of Worms was published and Placard (or Edict) after Placard against heresy followed up to the crowning one of 1550, by which death was made the punishment for reading heretical books, holding conventicles, or preaching heresy. A Papal Inquisition was set up in 1524, and the process of repression—a deduction from the theory of territorial sovereignty rather than a consequence of personal bigotry on the part of Charles—continued for many years. When Philip II. came to the throne (October 26th, 1555) there was no marked change in policy, but the Spanish leanings of the new King made his deeds more unpopular than those of his father, and the Netherlands, for the most part religiously at variance with their ruler, and exhausted by heavy taxation to carry out foreign schemes, were too tightly strung to bear much more. Philip's scheme for the new bishoprics, although intended as a national development, seemed to be a tightening of Spanish bonds and a multiplication of inquisitors; the minister Granvelle, once Bishop of Arras and now to be Archbishop of Mecheln, was also personally unpopular with the nobility. However much the persecution in this earlier stage has been exaggerated, the number of deaths had been

large and the repression stern. Philip's new action was the beginning of a war insignificant in its military details and wearisome in its course, but memorable for other reasons. It was an instance of national resistance to foreign rule, and this resistance became joined to a struggle for religious freedom. Because they were opposed to Spain the Netherlands got help from some of those who did not share their religious views; but because they posed as rebels they lost some sympathy which would otherwise have been theirs. The great independence of the towns, moreover, strengthened the resistance to Spain, but afterwards proved a difficulty to those who tried to form a national government.

The removal of Granvelle, a most capable minister, but a minister only, hated by the great nobles and wrongfully blamed for all that was done, hardly lessened the discontent with Spanish rule, and Philip's Edict (August 18th, 1564) enforcing the Decrees of Trent, brought things to a climax. A league of nobles (1566) against the Inquisition, called "the Compromise," was soon joined by large numbers. The government was at a standstill, and iconoclastic riots (August, 1566) were scarcely checked. These excesses caused many Catholics to withdraw from the national movement, and were the beginning of a division which, when intensified later on (1578), led in the end (1579) to the separation of Catholic Belgium from Protestant Holland. The military rule of Alva (1567-73)—supported by the finest army of Europe—was one of religious terror and civic tyranny, staying before neither small nor great. Like everything evil, it brought its own punishment with

The revolt,
1566.

it, and hatred of Spain became confused with hatred of Catholicism. But the Calvinists, if not so powerful, were equally intolerant, and it was their tyranny at Ghent (1578) which led the Southern Provinces to unite in defence of Catholicism and finally to accept the Spanish supremacy once more. But the Northern States, under the skilful guidance of William the Silent, formed a confederacy on the basis of national independence and religious freedom. If the toleration was not so complete as William would have wished, and if the Catholics of the South were excluded, his other aim of independence was fully secured. Spain bowed to the inevitable, and a truce (1609) was followed by the recognition of Dutch independence in the Peace of Westphalia (1648).

Apart from its political importance, the revolt of the Netherlands had vast influence on European thought. The country stood as an example to resistance to tyranny in religion, and it had to face difficult problems of its own. The Swiss Federation — the loosest of organisations — had almost broken up on the question of governing dependencies. Was religion a federal matter or one for the cantons to settle for themselves? Was the Federation to regulate the religion of the dependent or subject lands, or was each canton to follow its own policy when according to the Constitution its turn came to administer the dependencies? These had proved hard problems to settle, and something the same difficulty arose in the Netherlands. In the Federation between Holland and Zeeland (1576) William the Silent undertook, as ruler, to defend the Protestant Reformed Faith and to put

Thought
in the
Nether-
lands.

down all beliefs which were contrary to the gospel; but he meant to tolerate Catholicism. The Union of Utrecht (1579), which united the Northern Provinces, bound them together against foreign oppression, but left each province free to settle its own religion, although nobody was to be persecuted for his belief. Catholic worship, however, remained forbidden until the eighteenth century, although Catholics were certainly not in a minority, and Lutherans and Anabaptists, while allowed liberty of conscience, had not freedom to proselytise. Under these fluctuating conditions an acute controversy arose over the power of the State to control religion.

The earlier tendencies to learning had been even quickened by the impulses of national vigour. Leyden, in return for its brilliant defence against the Spaniards (1575), had been allowed to **Learning.** choose a favour for itself, and had thus gained the right to found a university, which soon became the leading one among Protestants. When Lipsius (the celebrated professor of Roman history there) joined the Roman Catholics the more famous scholar Scaliger was asked to take his place (1593). Feeling, as he said, that civil strife had banished letters from France, he accepted the offer and found himself the centre of a learned company, among whom he discerned the brilliant promise of Hugo Grotius. It was only natural that in a country where Calvinism was supreme and intellectual life vigorous grave questions should arise by way of reaction. We pass, for the moment, outside the Catholic Church in our survey.

In the Netherlands Calvinist organisation presented itself in a special form. The rich towns with their

close corporations were the very soil for a Presbyterian growth, and here it took on a strictness not gained in France. France had developed the synods, but the Netherlands, where the Church organised itself in the face of persecution and primarily as a religious body apart from the State, followed a more purely theocratic model. When the end of the war came it found a Presbyterian system completely organised, claiming to be independent of the State, whereas the cities and those who were building up a State sought to exercise some control over religious matters. Zwingli, in Zürich, had been willing to leave the power of excommunication to the city-state. Calvin moved slowly to the latest model, but his organisation of elders and the greater rigidity given to Church discipline marked a step in advance. The French Protestants emphasised the idea of synods already brought forward by Zwingli for Switzerland. The Netherlands had now a unique chance of organising a system which was to have no relations with the State and to share no powers with it.

The foundation of these claims to ecclesiastical independence was laid in the Calvinism of the Belgic **The Belgic** Confession, prepared (1561) by the Dutch **Confes-** refugee and martyr de Brès, along with **sion, 1561.** Saravia and others, and presented to Philip II. In this Confession the discipline of the Church for the punishing of sin, with its power of excommunication and the duty of magistrates to protect it, was firmly laid down (Articles XXVII.-XXXVI.). But the controversy which arose between Arminius (professor at Leyden, 1603-9) and his fellow - professor Gomar upon predestination soon

became joined to the other question of the right of the State to control the Church. And here they went back to the controversies at Heidelberg connected with the name of Erastus. Erastianism is commonly defined as the ascription to the State of the right to control religion, a theory rarely affirmed in its extremest forms, but often approached in practice. But Erastus himself merely went so far as to deny to the Church the power of excommunication, and to give coercive powers to the State alone; this, moreover, in a country where only one type of religion existed. He thus made a protest against the new clerical interference which at some times and in some places recalled and rivalled the Inquisition. But his writings and those of others were applied to the controversy which now arose under very different circumstances. Upon no subject were theories more confused than upon the relations of Church and State. Upon the Catholic side "Interims" and the Spanish method, upon the Protestant side the Lutheran rule of princes, might be contrasted with the high papal view of spiritual supremacy and the Dutch or Scots view of a Church wielding a rigid discipline; but no side seemed to have thought its system completely out. Catholics and Protestants alike agreed, as the Westminster Confession worded it, that erroneous opinions and practices, "whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation," or "destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church," might be proceeded against by the censures of the Church and by the power of the civil magistrate. But as to the methods by which the civil power should be kept in the right path opinions

and practice differed widely. The true path of toleration was as yet undiscovered; most men, like Baxter, were disposed to "abhor unlimited liberty and toleration of all," even if not able, as he was, "to prove the wickedness of it."

Arminianism in Holland in its reaction against the prevalent views of Calvinism became not only more tolerant even against Rome, but also readier to admit the interference of the State in matters of religion. The Calvinists wished to have a united Church left free to control religion throughout the land. But Uytenbogaert, chaplain to Prince Maurice of Nassau and successor to Arminius in the leadership of the party, after having presented five Arminian Articles (1610) on doctrine known as the Remonstrance, asked that a national synod (not purely ecclesiastical) under civil authority should meet and settle these points. They declared the existence of the Church as an equal body beside the State to have been a failure and inferred the need of State regulation. But the Counter-Remonstrants asserted for their part the strongest Calvinist tenets and the independence of the Church. They advocated the existing rights of the provinces, while their opponents wished to develop the rights of the central federal power. The struggle became political. The great statesman Oldenbarnveld supported the Remonstrants: Prince Maurice, led by motives of policy rather than conviction, their opponents. Oldenbarnveld was executed (1619), his party was scattered, its most prominent member Grotius escaping; and the Synod of Dort, at which English, Scotch, Swiss, and some Germans were pre-

sent (although not all as delegates), met (November, 1618–May, 1619). The theological canons formulated were rigid in their Calvinism, but the very triumph of their assertion marked the beginning of a stronger reaction not only on the Continent, but in England. It was not pure coincidence that Laud, tolerant in his views and accused of leanings towards Rome, should have relied upon the arm of the State, for the same was the case with those Dutch scholars, defeated at Dort, but having the future upon their side, with whom in theology and temper, although not in views of discipline, he had so much in common. A few years later the expelled Arminians were readmitted and tolerated even in Holland; their learning exercised great influence, but their theology was afterwards suspected, not without justice, of Socinianism. Meanwhile the victors were content to develop at their leisure a Calvinist Scholasticism of more than local power, which became more formal as it slowly lost touch of life. But the Netherlands had become for a time the centre of this controversy, which was a vital one for Europe. When political circumstances vary but little men may be content to act without clearly thought-out principles or policies; but when change and even revolution comes, then it is essential these problems should be discerned and solved. To drift and nothing more is a sign of weakness and not of strength or intelligence. We are beginning to see that the age of the Reformation was one in which these problems arose from the course of events, but not one in which statesmen or thinkers or theologians did much for their own part to solve them. We have inherited

something of their conditions of life, something also of their confusions of thought and vagueness of theory.

Spain, at the beginning of our period, stood before other countries in the revival of theology and the ideal of clerical life. Charles V., and after **Religion in** him Philip II., had stood forth with their **Spain.** nation's support as champions of Catholicism, although, as the Spanish bishops at Trent had plainly shown, of a Catholicism differing from that of Italy. From Spain had come out not only Ignatius Loyola, but also S. Teresa (1562), Melchior Cano (1560), types of pious mysticism and learning respectively, and also great missionaries like Las Casas (1474-1566). These form a varied record, and the policy of the kings was always, although in varying proportions, dictated by religion; even if at times, and especially under Philip III. (1598-1621), by selfishness also. We should then expect the religious influence of Spain to have been much greater than it was. Its religious promise at the outset of our period is undoubted; its political supremacy half-way through is equally undoubted; at the close of the period the lingering decay which to many minds sums up the history of Spain has undoubtedly begun. The influence of the Inquisition, so often assigned as a cause of this strange outcome, is by itself insufficient to account for it. The Inquisition itself, indeed, was but one instance in the special field of religious administration of the general Spanish method of government, absolute and bureaucratic, unsympathetic and rigid, founded on force, not leadership. Protestantism in Spain was a feeble and exotic growth which it did not take a great institution to suppress.

There were other causes at work, affecting both the political and the religious history of Spain. The country was all but ruined by heavy taxation, begun by Charles V. and continued after him. It had been drained of both money and men for lengthy and useless wars. The privileged classes, noble and ecclesiastical, escaped the burdens that fell on others and were often idle. The wealth that flowed in from the colonies seemed to make great enterprises possible, but it was badly used and dearly bought, and the government, through its incapacity to see great issues, failed to use its opportunities in the New World. No country can live upon mere traditions and correctness applied by force. Widespread idleness and national extravagance form but a bad atmosphere for religion to breathe. The Church in Spain, moreover, relied upon force and observances instead of persuasiveness and ideals, and therefore failed more there than elsewhere to control and to utilise the new forces of life around it. But the intellectual influence of Spain upon Europe was great upon one side, that of literature, especially in the two separated departments of devotion and fiction, and what was achieved in them should, under other conditions, have been achieved in others also.

The ecclesiastical history of France ran on lines very different from those of its great rival. The religious wars had caused great desolation. The harm wrought by them to learning is illustrated by many details in the life of Scaliger, and by nothing more than by the common scarcity of books. The clergy reported to the King (1595) that from six to seven out of fourteen archbishoprics, thirty to forty out of one hundred bishoprics,

**France
after the
religious
wars.**

were vacant; that 120 abbeys had no heads, but were managed by laymen; that three-fourths of the parochial churches had not proper priests. The interference of the Royal Council in preferments and grants of dispensations for marriage and pluralities was greatly complained of. When Henry IV. restored peace, 150 great and hundreds of smaller churches had to be rebuilt, and yet the consolidation of the Huguenots as a corporation apart from others and their concentration in certain towns had left the Catholics elsewhere room to work freely. So sharp was this separation that some of the Protestants cherished the idea of a separate republic, possibly under English protection, but the idea was discouraged by the best of their leaders. When Lewis XIII. supported the counter-Reformation by force, war broke out again, and the Edict of Grace of Nîmes (1625), while confirming the ecclesiastical and civil rights, withdrew the political rights given by the Edict of Nantes. Protestantism in France, like Catholicism, seemed to decay when in opposition to the Crown and to lose its independence when attracted to its side.

It was a striking tribute to the vigour of French thought that, even when hampered by the civil wars, **Thought** it was both so rich and widely influential. **in France.** Of the leaders in clerical education we have **Du Perron.** already spoken (Chapter X.). But there were other great thinkers and men of activity who kept alive the old traditions of Paris and reached something of the later intellectual supremacy of Pascal. Among these, Jacques Davy Du Perron, Cardinal and Archbishop of Sens, was a striking figure. Sprung from a family of Normandy Calvinists who had

emigrated to Switzerland, he naturally turned to the controversy which divided France, and as a result of his study became a Catholic. He was ordained in 1557, and in 1591 joined the Court of Henry IV. Consecrated as Bishop of Evreux, and sent as envoy to Rome, he soon became distinguished as a disputant, and his great argument with Du Plessis-Mornay, who got hopelessly lost amid Calvinist quotations and misquotations from the Fathers and Scholastics, achieved a great renown. In this dispute Casaubon was one of the moderators, and Du Perron's influence was probably a factor in preserving him from Huguenotism. To the end Casaubon's attitude in religion was cool and deliberate. "I do not condemn you; do you not condemn me," he said to his son, who became a Capuchin. And in the like spirit Scaliger could say, "All controversies in religion arise from ignorance of criticism." This was the tone of French thought—predominantly intellectual—which the wars overpowered. Many leaders were scattered. Robert Étienne (1526–59)—whose son Henry was author of the *Thesaurus*—head of the great printing-house at Paris, who made the division of the Bible into verses, found it needful to remove to Geneva, although his sons kept on his Parisian press. Religious controversy, added to war, made the quiet pursuit of letters impossible. In France this was a special loss. Nowhere were learning and intellect more abundant, and she was about to become the leader of European politics.

Many of these controversies concerned the Jesuits. We have already noted (end of Chapter X.) the opposition to their entry into France, as into Spain. The contest upon Augustinianism (see Chapter VII.),

begun by the Jesuit Molina and carried on by Suarez against the orthodox Dominicans, intensified this feeling. Molina (1588) contended that assuming pure Augustinianism the doctrines of the Protestant reformers followed logically, and hence he was led to assert that man may in some measure help both in his own conversion and good works. Suarez (1617) modified this view, asserting that grace congruous to man's nature is efficacious; incongruous grace, on the other hand, remaining ineffective although sufficient. Aquaviva, General of the Jesuits (1581-1615), who had previously (1586) issued a revised Rule of Studies (*Ratio Studiorum*) for the Society, now (1613) ordered this view of grace to be taught in their colleges. To this discussion, which the popes tried in vain to still, a whole series of other conflicts was added.

Most of the earlier Jesuits, like S. Ignatius, Lainez, and Borgia, the first three generals, were Spaniards. Upon Borgia's death (1573) Gregory XIII. suggested to the Society that a General from another nation should be taken, but his nominee, Mercurianus, proved incapable and the Society somewhat fell to pieces. Aquaviva, the fifth General, an energetic and youthful Neapolitan of French sympathies, found himself opposed by a disappointed Spanish faction, although, through the constitution of the Society and his power of appointments, he was able to hold his own. But this opposition first made clever use of the feeling caused by the *Ratio Studiorum*, which was circulated (1586) after some years' preparation and placed before the provinces for discussion, and then turned to the Inquisition for help.

The provincial along with others was arrested for venturing to deal himself with a crime reserved to the Inquisition, and the statutes of the Society were brought under review. None knew exactly what was at stake or what would result, and a royal visitation exercised through the Bishop of Carthagera was begun. But the influence of Aquaviva was strong enough at Rome to gain both the evocation thither of the cause and the prohibition of the visitation. Yet a little later (1592) Clement VIII. ordered the summoning of a General Congregation; Aquaviva at once made a satisfactory defence before the Society, but some suggestions of Philip II., by which they had to give up the rights of absolving from heresy and of reading prohibited books (here they conflicted with the Inquisition), and by which novices were in future to surrender their property or benefices, had to be complied with. The Pope also insisted upon the King's further demands that the superior officers should be changed every three years and general congregations should meet once every six years. Some of the faction opposed to Aquaviva, and specially Mariana, had also warmly opposed the general deviation from the teaching of Aquinas. The stress laid in the *Ratio Studiorum* upon adherence to the Thomistic doctrines in most points was qualified by exceptions; in practice the exceptions were emphasised, and this was certainly a new departure. The Dominicans, always jealous of the Jesuits, keenly opposed the novel views on grace and free will, and a public discussion at Valladolid (1594) attracted much attention to the dispute. Thus an air of uncertainty prevailed, and in Spain the Society was supposed to be under a cloud.

Many ecclesiastical and political difficulties of later times arose from the fact that medieval thinkers had rather made assumptions than laid down theories upon the relations of Church and State. Gradually and insensibly these assumptions became unworkable through the growth of great nations and the divisions of religion. Hence had arisen the disputes at Trent upon the "Reformation of Princes"; hence also arose the difference between Philip II. and the Papacy. Philip II. continued to act as the kings of the Middle Ages had always acted. The Papacy, met by denials of the powers it claimed, acted upon its former assumptions. But unfortunately for both parties, altered circumstances had made impossible the tacit compact by which Pope and King had worked together in the Middle Ages. At the same time there were not wanting theologians who, as we have seen, formulated in the plainest way the theory of papal power in itself. The Jesuits went a step further, and when theories of the State and Monarchy were put out as replies to the papal theory, discussed the origin and limits of the State itself. No controversy was more far-reaching in effect than this, for the theory of the State underlay all discussions of ecclesiastical matters and any progress towards religious liberty.

The Spanish Jesuit Mariana in his *De Rege et Regis Institutione* had maintained (1599) the lawfulness of tyrannicide and praised Jacques Clement for his conscientiousness in assassinating Henry III. of France. Lainez at Trent had asserted that while the spiritual power was derived immediately from God, the temporal power was only derived mediately from Him through the people. From the superiority of its origin

the Church thus gained the power of not only advising, but controlling the State. This was the view which Mariana developed. The Sorbonne issued (1610), against this justification of tyrannicide, a decree which the Jesuit Father Coton, confessor of Henry IV., stated his Society accepted frankly. But the discussion on the relations of civil and ecclesiastical power was a many-sided one. English Roman Catholics were required (1606) to take an oath that the alleged right to depose excommunicated princes was a damnable opinion. The English seculars, under Blackwell, were ready to take the oath. The Jesuits opposed it. Paul V. forbade the taking of the oath; a letter by Bellarmine, explaining his views, led to an expansive controversy between him and James I., seconded by abler but lesser writers. Bellarmine by his denial in his earlier controversies of the extreme position that the Pope was direct lord of the whole world had angered Sixtus V., and led him to include the volume containing it (until it should be corrected) in the Index (1590). But his later services to the papal cause outweighed the reputation of this earlier hesitation. These theories as to tyrannicide and control of the State were of more practical importance in France than in Spain; hence when (1594) Jean Chastel, a Jesuit pupil, tried to assassinate Henry IV., fresh strength was given to the movement that already existed against the Jesuits. The Parliament of Paris, followed by those of Rouen and Dijon, resolved to banish them from their districts. But at the King's wish (1603) they were afterwards readmitted, although even then the Parliament of Paris hesitated to register the Decree. Restraints were, however, placed upon

their action both as to localities and methods; one such restriction, the compulsion to have one of their members at Court, was skilfully turned to their advantage and Father Coton became a power. Henry IV. was anxious for France to be Catholic, but its Catholicism was to be superintended by himself, and the Jesuits were able instruments of his policy.

The University of Paris had been (1600) reformed by the State. Richer, once a prominent Leaguer, but now a Gallican and afterwards (1608) Syndic of the Sorbonne, was one of the reforming Commissioners. At a Chapter of the Dominicans (1611), the year after the murder of Henry IV., there were laid down for discussion three theses, asserting that: (1) the Pope is infallible in faith and moral doctrine; (2) a Council is not above the Pope; (3) the Pope confirms or disallows the decisions of Councils. Richer, who was an opponent of the Jesuits and also of papal claims, attended and forbade the discussion on the ground that these theses were opposed to the Decrees of Constanza, which the University from its old traditions supported. But as an outcome of the discussion Richer now published his *De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate*, which ascribed all ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Church as a body and to the Pope and bishops only as its instruments. Infallibility was said to belong to the Church only as a whole. And the papal power was limited by the Canons and not able to contravene them. The temporal jurisdiction belonged to the State, and in no wise to the Church. A lively controversy now arose in which Du Perron took a part. At first the Jesuits seemed likely to suffer, but in the end and after many com-

plications Richer resigned. The lengthy proceedings were a curious mixture of literature and litigation, but they illustrate the importance attached to the question, which showed great vitality. At the first States-General under Lewis XIII. (1614) the Ecclesiastical Estate sought the reception of the Decrees of Trent, to which the Nobles, but not the Third Estate, agreed. On the other hand, the Third Estate drafted a *cahier* which included a repudiation of the right of any power to depose sovereigns or to absolve their subjects from allegiance. To this it was suggested that all professors, teachers, and preachers should subscribe; while the opposite opinion was to be declared contrary to the Constitution of France and all persons supporting it were to be pronounced enemies of the State. But the attitude of the Third Estate and their firmness, even when confronted with learning and ability such as Du Perron's, showed the national feeling. A diplomatic arrangement evaded further conflict, but it was sufficiently evident that the plainer statement of papal claims had called forth a clearer expression of national sovereignty. For two centuries at least Frenchmen had been foremost in political theory, and hence the assertion of principles if not the adoption of policies was peculiarly forcible among them. When Richelieu desired friendship with the Papacy he had to curb the expression of these views, and a few years later (1626) he had to meet a request to forbid Jesuits to enter the pulpits of France. But that great statesman was no rigid partisan, and if at times he protected the Jesuits, at others he earned their disapproval. The ecclesiastical atmosphere of France remained after him, as before, a peculiar one,

and tended to become even more so. At times Gallican liberties remained in the background, but their reassertion was often a convenient weapon in politics.

Towards the end of our period controversies upon Probabilism and on Casuistry became keen. The **Change in Jesuit teaching.** former did not concern the Jesuits alone, for it was a Dominican (de Medina, 1577) who first propounded the view that if an opinion was probable it was allowable to act upon it, while the probability was made to lie in its being supported by some teacher of repute. The Spanish Jesuits for the most part supported this view; some leading Jesuits like Bellarmine opposed it, but before our period closed it was generally held by members of the Society. In itself it was the systemised outcome of the later medieval Nominalism, and was allied with that confessional casuistry which Pascal afterwards attacked. Interest in casuistry had been revived and was shown elsewhere, as for instance in England by Bishop Sanderson (1587-1663) as Professor at Oxford in his *Lectures upon Conscience and Human Law*, and Bishop Hall; in Germany, F. Baldwin and Buddæus treated of it also. That the Jesuits were driven to this special method of casuistry resulted from the combination of their philosophy and their position as confessors, often of influential people. It was an accommodation to the spirit of the world quite foreign to the mind of S. Ignatius himself. Much, probably too much, has been written of it, and the process has found able apologists, although it must be regarded as a sign of decay. But a complete discussion of it belongs to a later period, although the beginnings of it have to be noted here.

The *Ratio Studiorum* systematised the Jesuit methods

of education, but did not make any sudden change. Intelligence, adaptability, and directness of aim had marked their methods and continued to do so; but the system aimed too much at results and tended soon to become traditional and deadened. As the Society grew and its work became more complex, centralisation became more difficult for it. Aquaviva had refused to travel as his predecessors had done, and instead merely received reports at headquarters. Under this method the provincials naturally became more independent. At the same time the Society changed in other ways. Members without the keen sense of vocation which had been possessed by the original members lowered the spiritual tone of the whole body. Its practical work and the number of tasks to be accomplished intensified this effect. The professed members too now began to hold offices before held by coadjutors—as rectors and provincials. They had before this stood apart and exerted a peculiar influence upon the Society; now they became absorbed in affairs just as the other members and lost their distinction. Vitelleschi (1615–45), successor to Aquaviva, was gentle, but weak. Under him the older members formed an inner body with ambitions, but with an easier life of their own, while the younger members did the work. Thus it is to be noted that towards the close of the period, when the Society sank somewhat in reputation, the tie of submission to the General and the internal coherence of the Society were weaker than had been the case earlier. The activity of the Society, the controversies in which it was engaged, and the antagonism it aroused, sum up much history after the Council was over.

**Changes
among the
Jesuits.**

CHAPTER XIV

SCANDINAVIA : RUSSIA THE GREEK CHURCH : MISSIONS

THE east of Europe seemed to lie apart from general history. The fear of the Turks, the growth of Russia, and the fluctuating state of the south-east marked it off from the rest of Europe. Furthermore, in religious matters, the existence of the Eastern Church kept Eastern Europe apart and gave it interest of its own. The proposals for union and the discussions upon it at the Councils of Ferrara and Florence had turned men's minds to the "Holy Oriental Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church": by its conservatism, its trials, and its historic interest it drew further notice to itself. It suggested the past to which theological controversialists made appeal; the Papacy had made tentative advances to it, and Lutherans sought its alliance. Political conditions in the east of Europe were changing rapidly: fishers in troubled waters of controversy and diplomacy thought something could be gained; men of devotion and zeal thought something could be done. Hence the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have an importance for the east of Europe and the Eastern Church that lies even more in the fluctuations of relations than in permanent results. Sweden, Poland,

Russia, and the Greek Church illustrate some aspects of the age which it is not so easy to see so plainly in other lands.

With the imprisonment of Eric XIV., who had raised the nobles to greater power, Calvinism lost a great chance of success in Sweden. The **Sweden.** Lutheran settlement already made was **John III.,** open to the objection on one side that it **1568-92.** had been too conservative in ceremonies and details, on the other side that it had given up essential doctrines. But it had not worked well: the priests were too often unlearned and unworthy; the Holy Communion was celebrated with slovenliness; the churches were in bad condition. Calvinists had hoped for much under Eric. It seemed that the placid Lutheranism of the realm would be invigorated by an infusion of their views and practice. But the poisoning of King Eric, for which the Diet gave orders, repeated in 1575 and in 1577, placed John III. safely upon the throne. He was married to a Jagellon princess who had shared with him a long imprisonment, and he had hopes of becoming King of Poland—a Catholic country. He was something of a theologian as well as a linguist; and he had specially studied the writing of George Cassander (†1566), a theologian whom Ferdinand I. had consulted, and whose significance exceeded his influence. Cassander had tried to lay down a basis upon which Catholics and Lutherans could agree: the Apostles' Creed, the consent of the Fathers, a thorough reformation of abuses, the permission for clerical marriage, and Communion in both kinds. A work of his, the *Consultatio* (upon points of difference) was reprinted at Stockholm

(1577), and it was in his spirit of reconciliation that King John forwarded the Counter-Reformation. The new Archbishop, Gothius, worked with him; Cardinal Hosius directed the movement by correspondence, and two Jesuits were sent from Louvain (1576) with strict orders to present their views in a conciliatory and evangelical manner; they were to give the clergy instruction; the teaching of Prayers for the Dead and Invocation of Saints was reintroduced by order. It was fairly easy to raise the ritual, for the Lutheran Reformation in Sweden had been conservative in this respect, although the adoption of the "Augsburg Interim" (a compromise akin to that hoped for by John) had been refused (1549). The Red Book—a Liturgy in Swedish and Latin, based on the Roman Missal—was issued and enjoined. But it met with opposition; and on the other side the Pope (Gregory XIII.) urged the King to become a Catholic openly: he would not hear of any compromise and sent the Jesuit Possevin to influence the King. The attempt on Sweden was part of a crusade inspired by Spain, and Philip II. took a warm interest in it. There was a difference of opinion between the Jesuits, who had hitherto guided the movement, and the Pope as to the amount of accommodation possible. After much pressure John himself was received (1578), but the policy of gradual change was not given up. Swedish youths were sent for training to foreign seminaries, the Catechism of Canisius replaced that of Luther, and the tone of thought was gradually affected. But the King's political schemes did not meet with the support that he expected from Rome. His Polish wife died and his second wife had Pro-

testant sympathies. A change came. The Jesuits were expelled, but the use of the Red Book was still enforced with much severity. John died (1592), and his brother Charles, who had kept his land of South Ermanland Lutheran, became Regent.

John's son, Sigismund, who had been elected King of Poland (1587), was a devoted Catholic, and wished to give up his claim to Protestant Sweden. Clement VIII., however, urged him to take the crown and with it the chance of a Catholic restoration. But under Charles's leadership the "Moot" at Upsala, an assembly of laymen and ecclesiastics, had made a new and stringent settlement (1593). The Augsburg Confession was adopted, the Red Book and the current compromise were forbidden; "no heresy, Papist or Calvinist," was to be allowed. A new Archbishop (Angermannus), a strong Lutheran, was elected, and a sudden revolution carried through. Sigismund was compelled to accept these changes and guarantee support to the Augsburg Confession. He came to his coronation (1593), supported by a papal nuncio, Malaspina, and by a papal subsidy. The new King meant to favour Catholicism, and in secret protested against the promise he had made. The nuncio had opposed his making the promise, and it was only with the written leave of the Jesuits he had done so. Once more there was a disagreement between the Jesuits and other Catholic advisers as to the accommodation it was lawful to practise. The result was an open difference between the King's promise and his performance: he favoured Catholics and allowed their worship in some places. Finally the nation threw off their submission to him and Charles was

elected King (1604). The new ruler would for himself Charles IX., have preferred Calvinism, but the nation 1604. was so strongly Lutheran that he fell in with its wishes, and the path thus taken was kept to.

The Reformation in Sweden had begun from the Crown, and nowhere had the changes of the rulers a deeper effect upon religion. In the end, Lutheranism was so strongly fixed that Christina, daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, abdicated (1654) in order to become a Catholic. But that was after Lutheranism had been firmly re-established under Charles IX. The influence of mediating theologians upon John III. is worthy of note, and the failure of his attempt at a compromise is equally so. The policy of the Jesuits, even their differences with the Papacy in the midst of their success, is a significant feature of the history. The final failure of the Counter-Reformation—for the conversion of Christina is a poor set-off to the loss of the land—was a heavy blow to a widespread movement. It affected more lands than Sweden, for the north-eastern states formed a system of their own, and the attempt to regain Sweden was, as we have said, part of a wider movement. Sweden also shows the practical failure of a movement that was great in intellectual promise, but overlooked religious considerations. It came very near to the adoption of what was really an "Interim" of its own, and nearly carried out a "Counter-Reformation." Royal inclinations counted for much, but not for everything, and so the attempt failed.

In Poland, too, we see peculiar sides of the movement. Up to the Reformation it was the leading kingdom of the north-east, and was closely connected

with Sweden. Her growing territory and her military force were a bulwark against the Turks. **Poland.** Her attitude in religious matters was thus also important, and her religious history significant. A large part of the country towards the east belonged to the Greek Church, Lithuania and Galicia being mainly of that profession. On the other hand, she had ecclesiastical connections with Germany, while Russian Christianity again was thoroughly Eastern in origin and type. A separation was made (1415) between the two provinces of Lithuania and Eastern Russia, with Moscow as its head, by the creation at the old seat of Kiev of a new Metropolitan, depending upon Constantinople. Kiev had indeed been the original seat of the archbishopric until, upon the inroad of the Tartars, the see was transferred, first to Vladimir and then to Moscow. It was now restored to its old place, and thus the Greek Church in Poland gained more independence. About half the inhabitants of the kingdom thus looked towards the East, while the other half looked towards Rome. Hussite influence in Poland had once been active, but lacking national support, soon died away, although it left traces behind. The establishment of the University of Cracow (1400) gave Polish learning a home of its own, independent of Italy and Prague, and the culture of the nobles soon justified its boasts. The Renaissance in truth had a strong hold upon the country, and these new currents of life, in strange contrast to the sluggish paganism and political backwardness of the country, made the course of its history peculiar. Lutheranism entered Poland from Germany, and by way of the cities. Danzig (1524) distinguished itself by its adoption of

the new teaching and its violence in enforcing it, but Sigismund I. (1506-48) suppressed the movement (1526). Another influence to be noticed was that of the Bohemian Brethren, who were exiled from their own country (1548) and partly settled in Poland. Here they formed about eighty congregations, and many of the nobles sympathised with them. The liberty of the nobles, which verged upon licence, was afterwards a cause of political anarchy, but it was already a cause of religious disunion. Each noble thought he had a right to choose his own faith and force it upon his inferiors. Owing to the various religious tendencies in the surrounding lands—notably the Lutheranism set up by Albert of Brandenburg in ducal Prussia—Sigismund took up a firm attitude against religious change. He was not a bigot; he was lord, he said, of the goats as well as of the sheep, but repeated edicts in his reign repressed heresy until his successor's days. But the moral state of the Church was bad. The bishoprics and higher offices were (by a decree not rigidly kept) reserved to men of noble birth, and thus made less useful. Under the influence of the Queen Bona Sforza, the Renaissance took an Italian colour, both in its morality and scepticism. Her confessor, a Franciscan, Lismanini, was first a Calvinist and then a Unitarian. Some of the bishops who had bought their offices from her were noted for their evil lives.

Calvinism, more closely connected with the Renaissance than was Lutheranism, and also less German in origin, was better received in Poland. **John Laski,** Among Polish Calvinists John Laski (a 1499-1560. Lasco), nephew of the Archbishop of

Gnesen, a student at Wittenberg, a friend of Erasmus, a canon of Gnesen, superintendent of the Protestants of East Friesland (1543), pastor of the Foreign Refugees in London (1553), and a leader of change in Poland (1556), had a varied life and suffered much from sectarian hatreds. He joined in himself many and diverse influences and he strove energetically to unite the Protestants of his own land. But besides Laski many of the great nobles had adopted Calvinism, and under shelter of Calvinism Socinians found a refuge; their school of thought naturally found a ready welcome where Jews had been greatly favoured and were very powerful. In spite of the firm rule of Sigismund I. the Church fell into disrepute, and the nobles showed a great and growing jealousy of her privileges and powers; ecclesiastical courts were complained of; annates were abolished (1543); Church lands were taxed (1544), and the clergy subjected (1565) to the ordinary courts: the reception of dignities from the Pope had been prohibited (1538), and it was proposed to remove bishops from the Diet on account of their oath to the Pope (1559); on the other hand, ecclesiastics began to feel their responsibilities and seek for new means of efficiency: as means of Church defence a Synod (1527) recommended the Inquisition and an increase of teaching. The accession of Sigismund II. brought on a crisis. Sigismund II., He wished to marry Barbara Radziwill, a Calvinist. The bishops consented to his doing so (1550); the King in return issued an edict supporting the privileges of the clergy and the unity of the Church along with suppression of heresy. But the renewed vigour of the Church courts led to their

suspension for a year (afterwards extended to ten) in the interests of the gentry (Diet of Piotrikow, 1552).

Cardinal Hosius, In this revival of the Church Hosius, a remarkable figure, was the leader. He was 1504-79. descended from one of the many German families who had settled and formed trading colonies in the Polish towns. He studied at Padua and Bologna, he became Bishop of Culm and then of Ermland, was ambassador to Germany, and a distinguished writer and controversialist. He was made cardinal and a president at Trent (1561), and after a life of great devotion and unwearied labour he died at Rome (1579). It was on his invitation that the Jesuits came to Poland. Canisius visited the country (1558), and Lainez sent a permanent mission thither (1564). These allies of his helped Hosius to raise the standard of ecclesiastical efficiency, but, unlike him, they also made use of the changing and disturbed politics of the country. He was the leading figure in the Synod of 1551, which not only decided upon a strict enforcement of the heresy laws, but adopted his well-known *Professio Fidei Catholicæ* for subscription by the clergy and tried to force it upon the laity also.

Upon the opposite side, and especially as an advocate of clerical marriage, an equally striking figure was that of Stanislaus Orzechowski, formerly a student at Wittenberg, but now a canon and married. To gain his support at this crisis the bishops suspended his excommunication for marriage and promised to submit his case at Rome. Upon the death of his wife, however, he changed his views, and from an ardent supporter of

the national independence against the Papacy became an equally violent advocate of extreme papal control. His violence and his fickleness are characteristic of Polish thought and ecclesiastical politics. He played a great part at the Synod of 1552, many members of which had received a mandate against ecclesiastical courts. The suspension of these courts meant religious liberty, for while the determination of heresy was left to the clergy, no civil results were to follow unless secular courts mainly Protestant took the matter up. It was afterwards decided (1565) that excommunication itself should not cause any loss of civil rights. Wrongfully believing the King, who was in reality a moderate but firm Catholic, to be on their side, the Protestants took great advantage of the suspension of the courts. The Diet had further allowed every noble the right of worship at his pleasure, within scriptural limits, so that religious anarchy prevailed. The Calvinists and Bohemian Brethren had united themselves (1555), and by the *Consensus of Sandomir* (1570) the Lutherans joined with them in a Federal Union. On the doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's Person, and Justification, they reached an agreement. As a summary of their somewhat different views on the Holy Eucharist they adopted the Saxon Confession of 1551, which had been drawn up by Melancthon for the Council of Trent. In organisation and in the Communion they recognised their independence and kept their own rites. A Federal Council was arranged, pulpits were to be interchanged, but the existing organisations were preserved. It was an interesting experiment, for which Laski had prepared the way, and it was

fitting that it should adopt a Profession drawn up by the gentle and peace-loving Melanchthon. At later Synods, especially at Thorn (1595), this *Consensus* was confirmed, but the Lutherans gradually grouped themselves around the Formula of Concord, came to quarrel with their brethren, and finally dissented. An experiment, which in later ages has been sometimes suggested as a novelty, was thus tried and failed. A further dissension was due to the rise of the Anti-Socinians. Trinitarians. Lælius Socinus had spread these views in Poland (1551). Stancari, an Italian and professor of Greek at Cracow (1554), and Peter Goniondzki (1556) had followed him. In 1562-3 the holders of these views were expelled from the Polish Church, and (1565) they organised themselves into the Minor Reformed Church of Poland. Faustus Socinus, the nephew of Lælius, visited Poland (1579) and remained there, doing a great work of organisation until his death (1607). His predecessors had varied in their positive views, although agreeing in their negations, but he systematised their doctrines. Italian scepticism, working upon a Calvinistic basis amid the anarchy or freedom of Poland, thus became powerful; the Racovian Catechism, published at Racov in Southern Poland, became the recognised text book of the sect, which in Poland suffered much persecution from Lutherans and Jesuits alike. The Senate decreed (1638) the destruction of their leading school and the exile of their ministers; later (1658) they were expelled as a body.

There had been in Poland a strong national movement, demanding (1547 onwards) a national council; Sigismund II., with the general approval of his nation,

had sought from the Papacy the Mass in the vernacular, communion in two kinds, and the convocation of a national council for the remedy of abuses and the union of the many sects (1556). But this national feeling now died away, partly through the dissensions and anarchy of the Protestants and partly through the success of the Counter-Reformation led by the papal nuncios and Jesuits. The Jesuits did the work, but even here we must not overlook the native leadership of Hosius. The nuncios Lippomani (1555), Berard (1560), Bishop of Camerino, Commendone (1563-5, and again in 1571), Bishop of Zante, in their respective ways did much in inspiring the King to greater firmness, in gathering around them a Catholic party, and in reforming the abuses in the Church. Before Sigismund's sudden death (1572) he had refused in the Diet to put Protestants on a legal equality with Catholics, but when Henry of Anjou was elected after an expensive contest of diplomacy and intrigue, the Compact of Warsaw granted religious liberty to all *Dissidents* or Dissenters (January 23rd, 1573). Unhappily the nobles had the right to punish any disobedience among their dependents, and thus the principle of territorial religion was extended in Poland to every landed estate. This compact Henry had to accept before his coronation (May, 1573). His flight to France was followed by great confusion, which was ended by the election of Stephen Bathory, Prince of Transylvania (1576), although the nuncio Laureo had done his utmost to secure the election of Emperor Maximilian II. The new King turned out

**National-
ism in
Poland.**

**Henry of
Anjou,
1573.**

**Stephen
Bathory,
1573.**

a liberal sovereign, a strong Catholic, and a great warrior. His political schemes turning mainly on the acquisition of Russia were supported by the Jesuits, especially by Possevin. Inside the kingdom the King used the Jesuits widely for his great schemes of education in schools and for his new university of Wilna.

Stephen was followed by Sigismund III., son of John III. of Sweden and Catharina Jagellon. He was, **Sigismund** as already said, a devoted Catholic, and he **III.,** gradually changed the tone of the Senate **1587-1632.** by his appointments. Under the influence of the nuncios a kind of Edict of Restitution was enforced by the courts, restoring to Catholic worship churches that had been perverted by Protestant landowners. This and the education of the young nobles in the Jesuit schools soon changed the thought of the country. Furthermore, Catholics and Protestants were eagerly striving to absorb the Greek Church. **Sigismund,** partly by threats of excluding from **Synods of** the Diet those bishops who did not submit **Bresc,** to Rome, persuaded a Synod of the Greek **1594-96.** Catholics in Poland to discuss union. The terms proposed by some of the bishops, whose reputations did not commend their opinions, and afterwards approved of by Clement VIII., were the preservation of Eastern ritual and discipline, the use of the Slavonic tongue, and the recognition of the Council of Florence. But these terms left much discontent behind, and the Polish hierarchy was consequently divided into Orthodox and Uniat factions. The union was forced with much severity, soon alienated the Cossacks of the Ukraine and drove them towards Russia. In the same way Protestant parts of the land were driven towards

Sweden. As a result religious affairs and political schemes were hopelessly entangled. Poland was thus the protagonist of Rome in the East. So great had been the change wrought in the country that a legate could say (1598) that "heresy was being driven to the grave." The joint action of the Papacy, the Jesuits, and the Crown had been successful. Nowhere does the religious history give more instructive lessons than in Poland. The internal anarchy of the country, and the interest taken by its neighbours in its affairs, proved its political ruin. The same causes worked in the religious history and tended to their natural result.

In ecclesiastical and civil politics the rise of Russia disturbed the balance of the north. Poland soon lost its leadership through the rise of this new rival and by its own anarchy. Sweden, **Russia and the East.** champion of Protestantism, Poland, of Roman Catholicism, and Russia, of Eastern Catholicism, fought for mastership and also for territory, such as the secularised state of the Knights of the Sword in Livonia. Here the Grand Master, Gotthard Kettler, turned Lutheran (1561), giving up most of his territory to Poland, but keeping Courland as a secularised duchy for himself, after the precedent of secularised Prussia. But the natural antagonisms of these states were intensified by events in Europe: the rise of Protestantism, the revival of the Papacy, the energy of the Jesuits, the schemes of Spain. Politically, there was the unsuccessful attempt to secure Sweden for the Counter-Reformation and the successful attempt to secure Poland. Religiously, the success in uniting Lithuania with the Latins—a movement which was supported by persecution and caused much bitterness—

was balanced by unsuccessful attempts at the union of the whole Eastern Church. Besides all these disturbing factors, the influence of the Turks must not be forgotten; but in the latter part of our period the Sultans became mere figure-heads. The Christians under them enjoyed fair liberty, given for political reasons. The Patriarchs of Constantinople were recognised by the Sultan and paid him large sums on election, but they were liable to deposition for alleged disloyalty, and one Patriarch, the well-known Cyril Lucar, was deposed and restored five times. These changes and this subserviency naturally weakened the power of the patriarchs and degraded Christianity.

The rise of Russia begins with Ivan the Terrible, whose energy, cruelty, and deeds of massacre, followed by fits of penitence and devotion, recall the Russia. Frankish kings of old. He was great in Ivan IV. (the Terrible), war. He was victorious over the Tartars, 1553-84. but failed to gain a hold upon the Baltic. Ivan III. had already declared himself the Protector of all Greek Christians, and his grandson, Ivan IV. (the first to take the title of Czar), tried to realise this claim. The Jesuit diplomatist, Possevin—sent, although fruitlessly, to gain him for Rome—was not very successful, and Ivan made political use of his country's growing wish for religious independence. The Metropolitans of Moscow had been originally either consecrated or approved by the Patriarchs of Constantinople. The Metropolitan of Moscow, Isodore, had supported at Florence the union with Rome, and returned (1439) as a cardinal and a legate, but he fell into disgrace through his action, and finally died at Rome. After the fall of Constantinople the Metro-

politan was consecrated at home. Russia thus became more independent, and the later union of Lithuania with the Latins met with no support in Russia. But Ivan's treatment of the Church was fitful and barbaric. Hearing of the piety shown by S. Philip, Igumen (or Abbot) of the Monastery of Solovetsky, he forced the Metropolitanship upon him; then when the prelate remonstrated against his cruelty, he had false charges brought against him, cast him into prison and strangled him. Ivan burnt some churches and plundered monasteries, but he built others and endowed them. After a life of bloodshed and lust, redeemed by days of penitence and alms, he took the tonsure just before death and so died a monk. Russia, in its kings and its type of Christianity, its missionary successes, enthusiasm, and barbarism, carries us back to the Europe of the eighth century. But Ivan's reign had done something to strengthen Christianity. A Synod at Moscow (1551) passed the Stoglav, or Hundred Chapters. Monastic life was reformed, clerical property regulated, and the revision of the Liturgic books ordered. Some needed good was done, but the State held too much control over the Church.

Ivan was succeeded by his son Feodor (1584-98), but the real power lay with his brother-in-law, Boris Godonof, who poisoned Feodor's brother, Prince Demetrius, and was afterwards elected king (1598). Under Feodor, Moscow became the seat of a Patriarchate. The old number of five Patriarchates was held essential—Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople; Rome, it was contended, had forsaken the faith, and Moscow should take its place. The Patriarch of Con-

The Patri-
archate of
Moscow,
1589.

stantinople—Jeremiah—plundered of all the Church property by the Sultan, was on travel to collect funds, and happened to visit Moscow. His poverty and the prospect of help doubtless soon influenced him in consenting to the suggested new arrangement, which answered not only to the growing power of Russia, but to the needs of the Church. For Russia was, and has proved herself to be, a capable protector of the followers of her faith. The political advantages to herself of this protection were obvious, but she was not the only one to gain. The Metropolitan Job was consecrated as the first Patriarch (January 23rd, 1589). At the same time four bishops were made Metropolitans, and new sees were founded. Next year the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with about eighty other bishops, confirmed this change. An important step was thus taken, and as a result the Eastern Church was better able to keep its independence against Papacy and Protestantism.

The Lutherans had shown a wish to approach the Eastern Church, as it seemed to them that the opposition to the Papacy, common to them both, was a bond of union. Melanchthon had sent to Joseph II., the Patriarch of Constantinople (1555–1565), a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession. But nothing came of it under this Patriarch, whose troubled lot illustrates the difficulties of the day. He excommunicated the Metropolitan of Cæsarea for visiting Rome to bring about union, but he himself was deposed by a Council for simony—a charge that flourished in the evil air of the Turk. Some years later, Jacob Andreae and Crusius, professors at Tübingen, sent printed copies of the same Confession in Greek,

with letters and sermons upon it. Jeremiah II. (1572-94), then Patriarch, replied with the criticism they invited; one of his letters, his *Censura Orientalis Ecclesiæ*, being very lengthy. In the Lutheran document he found statements to commend only upon the regard for the Œcumenical Councils and the marriage of priests. All distinctive Lutheran views he condemned, and the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) long afterwards officially sanctioned this letter. A Lutheran reply could not draw the Patriarch into further controversy. The Eastern Church rejected Lutheranism and Calvinism as decisively as it did papal supremacy.

But although more than one Pope had failed to bring over Russia, and Boris Godonof claimed for Moscow both the Patriarchate and the name of "the true and orthodox Rome," events seemed to favour the cause of Rome. A pretender appeared in Poland, claiming to be Demetrius, son of Ivan. He joined the Roman Church and received the help of Sigismund III. and the papal nuncio for political and religious reasons respectively. He promised to do his utmost for the Papacy if he gained the Russian throne. Boris was defeated, and died soon after. Demetrius became King (1605); but the arrival of his wife, a Polish princess, and a large company of monks, lost him his popularity. The Swedish faction dethroned him, and after a struggle in which another Demetrius appeared, Ladislas, son of Sigismund III., became Czar. But the fight between Sweden and Poland called forth a combined national and religious movement. Bishops and clergy headed the people and bore the holy icons before them. They marched

**The false
Demetrius.**

upon Moscow and drove out the Poles (August, 1612).

The Once more we seem to be in the Middle Ages.

Romanof The House of Romanof was raised to the
Dynasty, throne. Its head, Philaret, Metropolitan of
1613.

Rostov, was too old for the work, and so his son Michael became Czar, while he was brought from prison and made Patriarch of Moscow. The union of Church and State, peculiarly close in the Byzantine world, was thus specially close with the new dynasty. The organisation of the Church was strengthened and its tone raised. The power of the Patriarch was increased, and the clergy, who were allowed many privileges, were placed more strictly under his control. The Orthodox Church in Russia had not only saved the nation, but in doing so had identified itself with a power which was to grow beyond all hope.

During the earlier years of the Turkish Conquest the ancient Church of Constantinople enjoyed a modified toleration from the conquerors. (See Vol. V.

of this series, *The Age of Schism.*) The
Cyril most prominent figure of the seventeenth
Lucar, century in the East was Cyril Lucar. This
c. 1572- remarkable man, somewhat like Cranmer in
1638.

his receptive mind and in his national zeal, like him too in a varied life and an unhappy end, was a native of Candia and educated in Italy. In the course of his travels he came to Geneva and grew into sympathy with Calvinism. He became successively Patriarch of Alexandria (1602) and of Constantinople (1621). His foreign experiences made him anxious to raise the level of education at home, and he helped in this by translating the New Testament into modern Greek; but he was also desirous of modifying the Eastern

doctrines in a Calvinist sense. He had sent young men to European universities, and he carried on a wide correspondence with theologians (it was he who presented the celebrated Codex Alexandrinus to Charles I.); and he imported (1629) a printing-press from England, a country which helped him with friendship and money. The politics around him were involved, and his own course was not only far from straight, but also troubled, for he was five times deposed and restored. His Confession, written in Latin (1629), and then in Greek, restated the doctrines of his Church, with Protestant additions. On Justification by Faith he compromised; Transubstantiation he rejected. He affirmed the inerrancy (or infallibility) of the Scriptures, the existence of only two Sacraments. He rejected Purgatory, and upon the Holy Eucharist he was Calvinist. The authenticity of the Confession has been doubted, but without much reason, and it fairly represents Cyril's position. He had many enemies, and much diplomacy, Jesuit and English, centred in his removal or support; and (1638) he was charged with disloyalty to the Sultan and strangled on board a ship. A Synod at Constantinople, under his successor and enemy, Cyril of Berœa, afterwards condemned him, as did other synods at Jassy and Jerusalem. Metrophanes Critopoulos, whom he had sent to study in England and Germany, where he had been supported by Archbishop Abbot at Balliol College and had published at Helmstadt a strongly Calvinist creed of his own, joined in his condemnation, changed his own views, and afterwards became Patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril of Berœa, who was strongly inclined to the Roman Church, if indeed he did not belong to it, perished a year later,

just as Cyril Lucar had done. His successor, Parthenius, was strongly anti-Latin. Thus the changes and struggles of the Reformation influenced the East.

The same wish to put forth confessions and catechisms prevailed in the East and West. With labours

of this kind is connected the name of **Mogilas**,
†1647. Mogilas, a soldier of noble birth, educated

at Paris, who became a monk and is called the father of Russian theology. He was chosen (1632) Metropolitan of Kiev. To strengthen his Church against all attacks he composed (1640), in the form of a catechism, the *Orthodox Confession of the Catholic Apostolic Church*. It was revised by a Russian Synod at Kiev and a more general Synod at Jassy (1643), at the latter of which Meletius Striga, Metropolitan of Nicæa, corrected and reshaped it; it was afterwards signed by the Eastern Patriarchs. From Russia there thus came forth the general creed of the Eastern Church. Mogilas also wrote (1645) a *Short Catechism* and corrected the office books, adding explanatory notes upon them. His interest in general learning and his labours rank him along with the great Western leaders of the day. The East was unhappy and disturbed, backward and conservative, but these epithets are far from summing up its history. It had to face keener foes than had the West, and yet the West has often dealt hardly with it, forgetting its troubles, which gave it scanty time for such constructive work.

This document is in three parts with an Introduction: arranged in question and answer. The **Orthodox Confession**. Starting from what an Orthodox and Catholic man should hold and observe in order to gain eternal life, in the First Part it explains

Doctrine at some length, in Part II. it expounds the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes under the head of Hope, and in Part III. under that of Love the Ten Commandments. It was thus both practical and theoretical, and also lengthy enough to give a connected view of theology. It is said to have been meant as a counterblast against the Protestants and the Latins, but it had a positive aim of its own.

Through the ignorance of copyists and the introduction of printing, the text of both Bibles and Liturgies had become corrupt and discordant. As early as 1520 a learned corrector had been brought from Mount

**The
Liturgic
Books.**

Athos and set to work in Moscow at correcting the Slavonic Bibles. The Synod of 1551 had affirmed the correction of service books to be needed, and thus the East felt the same wants as the West. But in the West greater movements cause us to forget that many a process which we ascribe to them, such as the revision of books of prayer, was natural and inevitable. The fulfilment of the task was left, however, for Nikon, a great ecclesiastic and patriarch under the Czar Alexius (1645-76). Nikon was upright, devout, and scrupulous in life and worship, with much of the strength and grandeur of the great medieval Popes. It was not unfitting that after he had fallen into disgrace one of his monkish admirers should dream of an enlarged and strengthened Russian hierarchy with Nikon as its Pope. This celebrated man, sprung from a peasant stock, had entered a monastery at the age of twelve; but he returned home to close the eyes of his grandmother, married, and became a parish priest. Some years

**Nikon,
1605-81.**

later his children died, his wife took the veil, and he himself began a new and more rigorous monastic life (1625). His strength of character and his rigour made his career a troubled one, but at length he became Igumen of a monastery at the mouth of the Onega. In 1646 he met the Czar Alexius, who was youthful and needed an adviser; devout and careful in worship, and therefore able to appreciate a conservative reformer like Nikon. The Czar made him his friend and promoted him rapidly. He became archimandrite of the monastery where the Czars were buried, Receiver of Petitions (an office which gave him political importance) and (1649) Archbishop of Novgorod. After three years' active friendship and service in Church and State he became Patriarch (1652). He had so far worked along with a Czar like-minded with himself. He now began a new career, doing for Russia what Laud did for England, attempting reforms akin to those of Trent, and at last falling in a struggle against the State. But his story must be told in a succeeding volume.

The Reformation period was thus for the Church in Russia, as in the West, a time of stress and change; a growing national and social life made new demands upon her; she started from a level lower than did the Church in the West; she had to struggle against ignorance and inertness rather than against perverted energy and speculation, but she had more than kept her place and her hold upon the nation's life. She had been affected by the troubles of the West, but she was able yet to mould the destinies of the East.

The new life that stirred in the Church soon carried

its zeal into wider fields. The discovery of the New World both opened up new lands and re-
vived the spirit of Christian enterprise. **Missions.**

The Society of the Jesuits was peculiarly active and self-sacrificing, but the older orders ran them close. No period saw more beginnings of great missions made, but Europe, as in the old Crusading days, carried its quarrels into its new battlefields. It was not only that religious controversies often thwarted missionary efforts, that the religious divisions of the Old World were reproduced in the New, but also that political feuds also reappeared there. Nothing is sadder than the quarrels of Spanish and French in South America; nothing is sadder than to see the intolerance of the Inquisition leading to cruelties like those of Menendez in Florida. France, like England, had conceived the idea of giving religious discontent an outlet in America, and the result was that Huguenot colony in Florida which the Spaniard Menendez destroyed. Philip II. endorsed his official's report of the slaughter: "as to those he has killed, he has done well." In the English colonies the religious divisions of home were reproduced, and those who had claimed tolerance for themselves failed to show it to others; too much, moreover, was left to chance and private enterprise, and the neglect of the episcopate, due to the State, but not remedied by the Church, was a grievous error. These are the evils which it is easy to see; on the other hand are the heroisms and martyrdoms, as well as the quiet persistence of unrecorded effort so easy to overlook.

The Papacy made many attempts to bring about union with the lesser religious bodies. For the

Maronites a college was founded at Rome to educate their clergy. In 1552 a division took place among the Nestorians of Persia—an offshoot from the Patriarchate of Antioch—now commonly called Syrians or Assyrians. Rival bishops, Simeon Barmama and John Sulakas, were elected, and the latter to gain support made allegiance to Rome, which his successors who moved to Ormia and, under the title of Mar Shimun, kept their jurisdiction preserved until the eighteenth century. This body is well known in England as the Assyrian Christians. The other body, which also offered allegiance to Rome (1607) and whose “Catholicos” or Patriarch lives at Mosul, is now the Uniat Church of Chaldæa.

The Copts of Abyssinia had fallen on evil days of Mohammedan persecution, and Queen Helena as Regent sent to Portugal for help. The next king, The Abyssinians, David, procured the consecration of a Portuguese, John Bermudez, as Metropolitan, whom Paul III. afterwards not only confirmed, but also made by his own authority Patriarch of Alexandria. The Emperor Claudius, however, in more settled days, quarrelled with Bermudez and sought a Metropolitan from Alexandria. The Roman obedience was all but lost when (1557) a Jesuit Mission was sent, one member of which, Oviedo, became Patriarch. Civil wars followed, in which finally the party of the Emperor and Jesuits were victorious. The Emperor Seltan-Segued (1626) joined the Roman communion, after Gregory XV. sent a Portuguese Jesuit, Mendez, to be Patriarch, and communion with Alexandria was broken off. But the extreme rigour of the Mission, and the

proscription of Monophysitism under pain of death, led to rebellions. The Emperor proclaimed liberty of conscience, and his son Basilides expelled the Latin Patriarch and the Jesuits. So as the Abyssinians sang, "the sheep of Ethiopia were delivered from the hyænas of the West," and the Copts of Abyssinia and Alexandria were reunited. Negotiations through the Jesuits under Paul V. with the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria led to nothing.

The congregation *De Propaganda Fide*, founded by Gregory XV. (1622), brought unity into the control of missions and placed them under the Curia's direct care. This was a natural result of the new position given to the Papacy at Trent, and the system proved successful in practice, both in control and the administration of funds. Isolated and badly directed efforts are apt to die away and leave no results. But here there was something very different; the organisation was made continuous, and its growth carefully guarded. Much of the success of the Roman missions is due to this admirable organisation. Under Urban VIII. (1627) the *Collegium Urbanum* was founded for the education of missionaries of all nations, and thus the plan of seminaries already used in European dioceses was utilised for the mission field. Once more the monastic orders proved their vast usefulness. Its first foundation was due to the generosity of a Spaniard, Vires, a papal official, but other donors enriched it with special gifts for different lands. Urban VIII. (1641) placed the institution under the control of the Propaganda. It is worth noting that the Greek College, founded at Rome by Gregory XIII., had given the chance of those efforts in

The
Propa-
ganda,
1622.

the East which have been noted, and the definiteness of aim thus illustrated was not long in making its mark.

The New World had been divided by the Pope between the Catholics of Spain and Portugal. Religious impulses were mingled with commercial. Dominicans and Franciscans followed the traders; in some cases, as in North America, they went before them. In the East Indies the Portuguese founded the first bishopric at Goa (1534), made an archbishopric (1557).

S. Francis Xavier. For some time the work was mainly among the immigrants and the Nestorian Christians, until S. Francis Xavier, a splendid example of missionary zeal (1542), led other Jesuits thither: he afterwards visited Travancore: thence he passed to Japan (1549), and started towards China, on the threshold of which he died (December, 1552). His labours had been apostolic and unwearied, and his last words were from the *Te Deum*: "In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted: let me never be confounded." His converts were numbered by thousands, but their edification had to be left to others. Not so much his permanent success as his disregard of self and his burning zeal made him a pattern missionary. In Japan 600,000 natives became Christians, but a change of policy by the Government (1612) led to fierce persecutions and many martyrdoms. Even thus early the problem of how to treat native customs and religions presented itself, and some Jesuits erred on the side of accommodation to such habits, as did Nobili in Malabar and Ricci in China. A keen dispute between Dominicans and Jesuits on the rightfulness of accommodation to native customs arose, which was submitted for settlement to

Gregory XV. (1623). The learning of the missionaries, especially in mathematics and astronomy, it may be noted, was greatly in their favour and impressed the peoples.

In America the evils of the slave trade (1506) greatly retarded the growth of Christianity, and the worst features of the Spaniards showed themselves in their treatment of the **America.** natives. These were assigned to different owners as servants (*repartimientos*) under condition of Christian instruction, but this condition was soon disregarded: the natives were said to be of different natures and useless to be taught. Paul III. had to state (1537) that he held them fit both for the Catholic faith and for the Sacraments. The Spanish rulers, it is true, had set before themselves the Christianising of their new subjects. The laws for their protection, civil and religious, were admirable, but the King was far away, and there was every temptation and opportunity for unjust officials. Peculiar powers in ecclesiastical matters had been granted to the Spanish Crown by Pope Alexander VI. (1501). The King became legate in America, the Church in Mexico was self-governing under the Crown, and there was no appeal to Rome. The Christian missions in these countries had thus local coherency and independence, but their connection with the Crown and the administration wrought harm as the monarchy decayed. Six Jesuits under Nobrega set out to the Portuguese colony of Brazil (1549); a bishopric was founded at San Salvador (1551), and many of the natives who had been cannibals became Christians. The most peculiar of the missions, however, was that in the Spanish colony

Paraguay. Here the earliest missionaries, Franciscans (1580-2), were not very successful, but the Jesuits (1586) quickly identified themselves with the country. Philip III. (1602) allowed them to form a native state which they administered for him; he allowed them to exclude all other Spaniards from their "reductions." The Jesuit rule was patriarchal, but worked for happiness and prosperity, although not fully developing the native character. Disputes, however, arose between them and neighbouring bishops; the Jesuits were charged with being too intent upon amassing wealth, just as later they were charged with too great intentness upon trade: the sequel of this curious ecclesiastical state lies, however, beyond our **Bartolomé** period. In Mexico and the West Indies **Las Casas**, the work of Las Casas was untiring, and **1474-1566**. remarkable not only because of his interest in the natives (for that he shared with others), but because of the principles upon which it was based. He had gone out (1502) to Hispaniola (San Domingo), and like other settlers he owned slaves. Touched by the preaching of some Dominicans he received holy orders. One day a Dominican refused him absolution so long as he held slaves; he thought the matter out and threw his whole restless energy into the fight against slavery. He found opponents in some of the government officials (although Cardinal Ximenes and Loaysa, confessor to Charles V. and afterwards Archbishop of Seville, were exceptions), in some local bishops, and generally in the colonists. Charles V. himself inclined to Las Casas' view; in 1517 and again in 1542 he legislated in its direction and gave Las Casas an official right to protect the Indians.

The position which Las Casas took up was that personal liberty was inalienable and that slavery was against the gospel. It was a noble protest to be raised in an age when cruelty was common, and it had a great effect. But missionaries even then had to face the same problems as now; relations with colonists of their own race and with natives of others were difficult and delicate. Missions supported by a State are greatly handicapped, and it was often difficult for others to exist.

In New France the mission work was very different, but its full history lies outside our period. Priests accompanied the early settlers, and even when the Huguenot de Monts went to Port Royal (Annapolis, N.S.), he had with him, besides his own ministers, Catholic priests for the savages (1604-5). Little, however, was done in Acadia until the Jesuits came (1611), and even their success was limited by the ill-fortune of the colony. Champlain brought into the St. Lawrence district four Récollets, as the French Franciscans of the strict observance were called. They ministered in lives often lonely along that great river and far west to the Ottawa. Jesuits came to their help (1625), and after the temporary loss of Quebec to the English (1629) the Society went on working after its restoration (1632). From their station at Sillery (1637) they founded missions on the Kennebec southwards towards New England (1646), and the mission at Tadoussac, the centre for the fur trade, stretched its influence up the Saguenay and down to Labrador. Other stations were Three Rivers (1633) and Montreal (1641). Récollet brethren

Canada.
The
Jesuits ;
the
Récollets.

(1620-3) undertook missions to the Hurons, and afterwards (1634) the Jesuits joined them in what was to be the greatest mission of New France. But, like the colonists, the missionaries suffered from the all-devouring Iroquois, and cruel, lingering deaths often ended lives of privation. Finally the missionaries were driven back, first to the Isle of Orleans, and then to Lorette, near Quebec. Out of twenty-nine missionaries seven had been martyred. The Iroquois destruction seemed to have ended their work and to have utterly blocked the way for the colonies. But a new day dawned when these very Iroquois (1653-5) opened negotiations and invited the missionaries to their territories. No missions have a story of more self-sacrifice; none have a more romantic background, in the land itself and in the Indian races who dwelt there, than have those of New France. The French Canadian Church of to-day by its high standard and its influence upon daily life has shown itself worthy of such a past.

By their extent then and by their spirit the missions of the period had wrought much and promised more.

Results. The evils of European life, its intolerance and its divisions, appeared in them, it is true, but so did a devotion and a love of Christ, which, although often hidden, ever beat strongly in Europe too. The Catholic Church must be judged, sometimes to its loss, but here to its gain, by its missions as well as by its life at home, by its extensions as well as its intensity.

CHAPTER XV

THE PAPACY AFTER TRENT

AFTER the Council a marked change came over the Papacy itself. There were Popes of varying character, some spiritually minded, others of a political stamp. But even these last did their duty conscientiously, for they, like the bishops in Germany, were affected by the spirit of reform. Nepotism of the old style was impossible. No Pope was able to form a principality for his family. Paul V. and Urban VIII. enriched their families, the Borghesi and Barberini respectively, and papal nephews were used for the management of affairs, but that was all. The Popes attended to their office with a sense of responsibility, and were careful in choosing bishops and in guarding ecclesiastical interests in different lands. The great objects of papal policy were no longer purely territorial, although even in this way the reigns of Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. were fortunate in the gain of Ferrara (1598) and Urbino (1631). The Popes had high ecclesiastical, although not necessarily spiritual aims, such as the recovery of lands lost to their religious leadership. Subsidies intended to benefit Catholicism were lavishly given; to provide these, and thus make this policy possible, heavy taxation was put upon the

**The
Papacy.**

Papal States. Nearly all the offices of State were sold and fresh offices were created mainly for their sale. Loans secured upon certain taxes were raised. Sixtus V., who systematised the finances in this way, had by these means saved a large sum, but Gregory XIV. quickly spent much of it. In the Middle Ages the financial system of the Papacy had been the mainstay of commercial Europe, filling the same place in it that the great financial houses do to-day. Hence many interests had centred in the Papacy, and those who were discontented with the organisation of society had drifted into opposition to it. For this reason, among others, opposition to the Papacy was so often found in cities, where commercial conditions were changing rapidly. In France, for instance, even more than elsewhere, anti-papal movements and Huguenotism had been city movements, and were bound up with the rise to wealth of new classes and with changes in financial conditions. The Popes almost alone among mediæval rulers had always command of ready money, and this had secured their power. Thus too at the beginning of modern Europe the wealth of the Popes, and the subsidies they could afford, made them important and able to reach their aims. Pius V. in his organisation of the league against the Turks, which resulted in the victory of Lepanto (1571), recalled the days of his namesake Pius II., and Gregory XIII. continued the policy. We should not forget that Moslemism was a living dread, as is testified by one of the most touching of devotional books, *The Sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ*, by Father Thomas of Jesus, an Augustinian friar. He had been taken prisoner by the Moors in Africa

(1578), at first suffered long imprisonment himself and then ministered to other prisoners, whom his devotions were meant to help. Stories of imprisonment like his and that of S. Vincent de Paul were common, and the Papacy therefore did well to try and rouse Europe to this war of defence. For this political leadership the Papal States, now consolidated, with brigandage suppressed if at times recurrent, and with the turbulent nobles reduced, gave the Papacy the means. Accordingly it became in the period after the Council of Trent distinctly a political force. The Popes, with the exception of Innocent X. (who was disgraced by his subserviency to a greedy sister-in-law), were diligent and conscientious rulers; Pius V. actually reached the official standard of saintship, being canonised by Clement XI., and Gregory XIV. deserved it.

The organisation of the Curia was of great importance, but its history, upon which much light is now being thrown, is difficult to trace. A memoir of the year 1574 by Giovanni Carga, one of the officials, illustrates the organisation and also its confusion. In the earlier Middle Ages the business habits of ecclesiastics were better than those of laymen. After a time secular business became better organised and secular men showed more business capacity. Hence there often resulted disorder in ecclesiastical matters as compared with those of civil life; hence too came the tendency to employ ecclesiastics less in business of State. The history of religious as compared with civil jurisdiction, and the government of ecclesiastical (and notably of the Papal) States, are proof of this. There was accordingly much

**Organisa-
tion of the
Curia.**

that was haphazard in the organisation, and there was much confusion, especially, perhaps, in the preservation of documents. The arrangements of the Curia in the earlier Middle Ages excelled those of temporal courts; in our period they fell behind. Martin V. first assigned to the secretaries a fixed stipend. Calixtus III. and Paul II. reserved the title of Secretaries for six officials. Innocent VIII. added to the existing six no less than twenty-four colleagues, these offices being saleable and forming a college. We also find a domestic secretary whose office grew in importance and was very confidential. Leo X. founded a Secretaryship of Briefs, and at a later date we find three secretaries of briefs, along with six for Italian letters. These officials formed a kind of college, apart from the domestic secretary. Then above all and in a unique position we have the Cardinal Superintendent, who is not only a confidential minister, but has a real effect upon the papal policy. There had thus been a process of differentiation between what we may call affairs of State—with which the Secretary and the Cardinal Superintendent supported by many lesser officials had to do—and the affairs of business and routine belonging to the colleges, such as that of the secretaries of briefs. Business had vastly increased, and the Curia, although its intelligence is often praised, had not met the increase with the wisdom shown by temporal courts. There was much confusion, and the use of offices as means of raising money by their sale led to a useless multiplication of them, and made reform or simplification impossible. On the one hand, interruption of policies, changes due to the varying personal habits and wishes of Popes, worked along with the conserva-

tism and tradition natural to departmental work on the other hand, to prevent reform and cause confusion.

When Pius IV. had closed the Council of Trent his labours seemed to be ended. In his later years he somewhat disappointed the more earnest spirits who wished to carry out the reforms at once.

The chance of his death (December 9th, 1565)

Pius V.,
Jan. 7th,
1566.

was used to elect in Pius V. a Pope of a different stamp, sternly and severely religious,

May 1st,
1572.

Micheli Ghislieri, a Dominican and a former Inquisitor in Italy, whose life after his appointment as cardinal, and even as Pope, had been simple and ascetic. He brought to the Papacy something of the spirit of the Inquisition itself. Muretus could praise him as "thinking life unworthy unless spent in purging heretics of their errors or the world of their presence." At the same time he carried out reforms both in the Curia and in the granting of dispensations. It was his task to translate the ideas of Trent into facts of life. The Breviary and the Missal belong to his rule, and sentiment was thus consolidated before passing away. But in his dealings with sovereigns he was contrasted with Pius IV., who had skilfully drawn rulers to his side. He ordered the bull *In Cœna Domini* to be read every Maundy Thursday (whence and not from its opening words *Pastoralis Romani Pontificis vigilantia* it gains its name) in all Christian lands. But as this bull, besides excommunicating all heretics and Protestants, claimed for the Church all its medieval privileges, many states refused to obey the command, and thus international relations were disturbed. His spirit which infused rigour into the politics of France, the Netherlands and England, was not wholly admirable;

but his piety was undoubted, and he gave unity and coherence to the papal policy (May 1st, 1572).

His successor, Cardinal Buoncompagni, was by nature an easy-going ecclesiastic, who yet, under the influence

of the new spirit, was fairly rigorous. By
Gregory XIII., a sound instinct he systematised the govern-

May 13th, ment of the Papal States, checking the
1572. banditti and forcing the nobles to justify

April 10th, their titles to their lands; thus a surer
1585. basis was gained for the support of external

undertakings. The old system of government by the advice of the College of Cardinals assembled in consistory was proving ineffective; either its members were divided in views or else one or two able men gained undue influence; furthermore, in a world of changing states and policies, pressing matters came up oftener than of old. Hence the method of Congregations was systematised, and under Sixtus V. was further developed. There now existed seven: for questions arising out of the Council; for the Turkish War; for affairs of Germany (this Gregory himself added); the Inquisition; the Index; the Segnatura or final tribunal, regulating all lower courts and granting graces; the Consulta, which was administrative. As special objects became important or lost their importance, new Congregations were formed or old ones ceased; and Sixtus V. added to the number, making fifteen in all, among them being those for the University of Rome (the Sapienza), for liturgies and new bishoprics. Gregory's new permanent Nunciatures, already mentioned (see p. 301), were a natural development of the old organisation, used not only for ecclesiastical business, but for diplomacy. All these

institutions made for watchfulness, and built up an effective centralisation which had been lacking previously, but was essential if the conciliar reforms were to be carried out. His intense interest in colleges, to which he was an unwearied benefactor, in Germany has already been noted. But his reform of the Calendar (1582), which by the older system had become so disarranged that Saints' Days were falling out of their old seasons of the year, is for ever bound up with his name. Religious dislike hindered its adoption. It was taken up by the Protestants in Germany in 1699; and then in Switzerland, 1701; England, 1752; Sweden, 1753; France, Holland, Catholic Germany and Switzerland (1583-4), Spain and Portugal adopted it to begin with (1582). By this needed change Gregory meant to claim the Pope's ancient leadership of Europe. But division had gone too far for agreement to exist even in science.

The exhaustive means adopted by Gregory XIII. to raise funds had brought discontent and trouble upon the Papal States, and the Pope himself became feeble and unhappy. His successor Felice Peretti, Sixtus V., was above all things strong and full of belief in himself. Sprung from a peasant family, he had joined the Franciscans as a boy, and had risen rapidly by his talents. He had formed friendships with the men of most saintliness, Cardinal Caraffa, SS. Philip Neri and Ignatius Loyola, and also with men of learning. As Cardinal he had begun at Milan an edition of S. Ambrose, which was afterwards printed at Rome. As a preacher, a theologian, an adviser of the Curia in theology, and, when, under Pius V., Vicar-General

Sixtus V.,
April 24th,
1585.
Aug. 27th,
1590.

of the Franciscans, as a stern reformer, he became famous. At Venice, where he was Councillor to the Inquisition, and in Spain, whither he accompanied Cardinal Buoncompagni for the investigation of Caranza's case (p. 236), he gained experience of affairs and made some enemies. Pius V. (1570) made him a Cardinal (di Montalto). He utilised a period of disgrace under Gregory XIII., who disliked him, for building and for study. He was interested in canon law along with Patristics and the Bible, as he testified by a work upon Gratian and encouragement of Cherubini's *Bullarium Romanum*. He owed his election as Pope to his own strictness and the self-control shown in his retirement. The story of his age (he was sixty-four) and infirmities being his recommendation, and then being suddenly cast aside, is mythical. His rise had been rapid and great, and he had scarcely learnt the limitations of events. He was something of a fatalist and more of a believer in himself. There seemed to be no limit to what he, or rather the Papacy with Rome, could do. Hence he formed vast plans, and miscarried in his political schemes alone. His vast schemes of buildings, the additions to the Vatican, the library, were all part of a great scheme. Pagan Rome was to be overshadowed by Christian Rome, once more the capital of the world, rising out of the past and making use of all possible knowledge and learning. A printing-press was added to the library, and here the Septuagint and Vulgate were to be printed. Sixtus was not very friendly to the Jesuits, whose rules and very name he had changed, although his successors revised his Decrees, but he understood, as they did, the need of enthusiasm

and the work that had to be done. He was not inclined to stand upon prerogative; he closed up some differences of a smaller kind, and abolished the Congregation upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction, from which many disputes had arisen. He reaped the reward of peace with his neighbours and could devote himself to greater aims.

His European policy was not successful. It was marked by largeness and firmness, but he hardly knew what he could effect and what was beyond him. He was driven into the arms of Spain, the power which had the same religious aims as himself, and yet a power which, from its tendency to dictation and its influence in Italy, was most distasteful to him. France was distracted, and he was averse from treating with the future Henry IV.; he therefore supported the League and Spain. Against England he joined with Spain, and the defeat of the Armada was a bitter although not an unexpected grief to him. But there was a slight difference of view between the Pope and Spain: the Pope did not wish to destroy France as an independent state; Spain wished to make France subordinate to itself; and hence in regard to France the two allies were not always closely at one. But when Venice, seeing in him a possible help against Spain, ventured to congratulate Henry IV. of France upon his accession, Sixtus was furious against the Republic, and would at first hardly listen to the explanation given by the special ambassador from Venice, Leonardo Donato; but as he gradually cooled down he veered round towards Henry IV., who might after all become a Catholic. High as was Sixtus' idea of the papal

power, he had a lack of perseverance in his firmness. His very face is that of a dreamer rather than that of a man of action. He was always consistent in his ends, but not always so in his way of reaching them. Thus he now received the French envoy with friendliness. But when Olivarez, the Spanish envoy, protested against this action (March, 1590), urging the excommunication of all the followers of Henry IV. and his utter exclusion from the throne of France (which the Pope had previously declared in 1585), further backing this request by a threat of renunciation of allegiance to the Pope, Sixtus yielded and for a time inclined to Spain. His ultimate policy was yet uncertain, and he was vacillating from one side to the other when he died (August 27th, 1590). So much had Spain become identified with orthodoxy that the suspicion of unorthodoxy which had floated around Sixtus in earlier years had grown stronger in his later years, when he worked less well with Spain. He had been a great, if not a wise, Pope, guided in policy by ecclesiastical interests, but his feelings and views were perhaps in the first place ecclesiastical rather than religious. Europe was passing into a period when it was easy to treat religion as a principle which dictated leagues and excited wars rather than moulded life and hallowed souls.

The relations between France and Spain made the conclave of election momentous. And yet unlike the old days in which France and Spain had formed parties in the College of Cardinals, the divisions now found there were made on a new principle. The family and the "creatures" of the late Pope—that is those cardinals whom he had "created"—formed one party ;

his opponents, those who had suffered from him or been passed over by him, formed another. The cardinals had now more freedom and their divisions were taken diplomatic advantage of. As a rule the party opposed to the late Pope carried the election; thus changes of policy, temporal and ecclesiastical, became almost a rule. In the present case the creatures of Gregory XIII. carried the election of the Genoese Cardinal Castagna (Urban VII.), a strong supporter of Spain. The new Pope lived only twelve days, and on his death Philip II. named seven cardinals whom he would accept: no others would be agreeable to him. Some of these names were rejected by Cardinal di Montalto, grand-nephew of Sixtus. In the end both parties agreed upon Cardinal Sfondrati, Gregory XIV. (December 5th). Cremonese by descent and attached to Spain, a mystic of deep devotion, he threw himself heartily into the cause of the League and Spain, commanding all Catholics to stand aloof from Henry IV. and sending subsidies to his enemies. The fate of France seemed settled, for a determined Pope able to use the treasure saved by Sixtus V. could have done much; but after a rule of only ten months Gregory XIV. died (October 15th, 1591).

Urban VII.,
Sept. 15th,
1590.

Gregory XIV.,
Dec. 5th.

The new Pope (Fachinetto), Innocent IX., again one of seven nominated by Spain, was Spanish in sympathies, but old and sickly. After two months he too died (Oct. 29–Dec. 29, 1591).

Innocent IX.

All these repeated conclaves had resulted in an understanding between Cardinal di Montalto and the Spanish faction, but it was clear that a strong and

energetic Pope was now a necessity. It was supposed that Cardinal San Severina (Santorio) would be elected. He was suitable in years and strength, an extremist of the Spanish faction, but a man feared for his severity. On the very point of the election some of his supporters hesitated, and the conclave fell back upon Cardinal Aldobrandini, a "creature" of Sixtus V., but one to whom the Spaniards had no objection. He belonged to a learned Florentine family, had been a Roman official and a nuncio in Poland. He was diligent and regular in his devotion and his business. Under him for thirteen years the Papacy at length enjoyed a steady rule of unbroken traditions.

Clement VIII., He let himself be formed by his office instead of moulding it to himself. His treatment of the French question was cautious and wise. The reception and recognition of Henry IV. came about gradually, and thus the danger of separation on the part of France was avoided. This alone would have marked his Papacy, but it had other claims to importance. The publication of the Vulgate has been mentioned, alterations in the Breviary (in which Baronius wished great changes), and the controversies on grace, for which the Pope appointed the *Congregation de Auxiliis*, also marked this reign. Clement was unwearied in all his duties, so much so that the congregations sank in importance and the advice of the cardinals was often collected privately instead of in a body. He was also a priest of deeply spiritual life and regularly heard confessions. His rule was thus open to few objections, personal or political, and these years of peace did a work of the utmost importance. He left the Papacy secured from Spanish control, not

only through the growth of France, but by its own stability and power.

The growth of a French party in the Curia, a natural result of the conversion of Henry IV., was shown by the election of Cardinal de Medici, Leo XI., a connection of the French royal family, but he only lived twenty-five days. Upon his death Baronius, who had been made a cardinal by Clement VIII., was nearly chosen, but Cardinal Borghese (Paul V.) was elected (May 16th). The new Pope was of a legal mind, as so many Popes from Gregory XIII. onwards had been. He had few enemies and had seen little of active life, although versed in the quieter business of the Inquisition and papal offices. He enforced rules upon others, even upon the cardinals—as he did upon himself. Any rights or powers which he conceived to belong to the Church he, unlike Sixtus V., was determined to enforce. His Papacy was therefore marked by struggles with states, and the famous contest with Venice—the old rival of Rome in ecclesiastical and political matters—was of more than local or temporal importance. For Venice, like France, had contributed much to the history of thought, and had filled a great place of old.

The endeavour to carry out the Decrees of Trent, no less than the new spirit of ecclesiastical zeal, drew the Papacy into dangerous currents. Very often diplomacy had smoothed over the difficulties that met it, but Paul V. was firm rather than diplomatic. Naples, Savoy, and Genoa, with all of which he was embroiled in disputes as to ecclesiastical rights or jurisdiction, yielded to his insistence. But Venice was a different state. Here some church-

Leo XI.,
April
1st-26th,
1605.
Paul V.,
1605-21.

Venice
and the
Papacy.

men had been tried for disgraceful crimes before the ordinary courts. By a new law a veto was claimed upon the erection of new churches in its territory; the acquisition of property by the Church was also restrained. To all these irritations were added boundary disputes with Ferrara (now a papal dependency), and complaints against exemptions granted by the Pope from payment of tithes. There had always been an anti-papal party in Venice, and these discussions made it more active. Its leader, Leonardo Donato (who had been ambassador to Rome under Sixtus V.), was elected Doge in 1606. To Pope Paul's demand for the cession of the ecclesiastical offenders mentioned above and the repeal of the new law, the Venetians replied by demands that all bulls published in their territory should be first approved by the State, that only Venetians should be appointed to their benefices, and that no taxes should be levied in their state for the Curia. Venice had lost something of its old importance as a state, and quarrels with it might therefore seem of little significance; but the ability of her statesmen and the literary power of her writers still remained, and these added to her old traditions made this incident seem large. Fra Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623), Provincial of the Servites, proved an advocate of peculiar skill. His *History of the Council of Trent*, in spite of some defects, partialities, and errors, is perhaps the most considerable work of our period. This contest with the Papacy was only an incident in his life; an occasion for stating his views rather than an influence that formed them. The religious types of mind favoured by Spain and the Jesuits were distasteful to him; the political power of Spain, the

theoretical claims of the Papacy, were so also. He had much sympathy with thought in France. He was somewhat English in his ideas, and it was strange that his *History of the Council of Trent*, brought to England in manuscript by de Dominis, Bishop of Spalatro should have been published there. He had composed other works and had borne a part in other controversies; but this, his chief work, written, of course, with a bias, is the key to his position. His thought was a criticism of all that the Council had resulted in. He was in ecclesiastical politics much what Machiavelli had been in civil, a critic and an assertor of far-reaching theories by his negations rather than by his assertions.

At the age of fifteen Sarpi had joined the Servites and had soon become known for knowledge of all kinds, theological, historical, and scientific. At sixteen he disputed at Mantua on the authority of Councils and the Papacy; at twenty-four he lived in Milan under Cardinal Borromeo; when twenty-seven he became Provincial of his Order and was ordained priest. As Procurator-General of his Order he lived for three years at Rome and had redrafted in a strict sense the rules of his Order. Thus he had been brought into touch with the best and most influential Church movements of the day. At Venice, moreover, political thought and experience were almost a tradition. The little society of "the Ridotto Morosini," where he knew the leading Venetians of his day, combined the best traditions of the Renaissance and of Venetian statecraft. In knowledge, insight, and character Sarpi was a typical Venetian product. It is especially worth note how

Sarpi's life,
1552-1623.

he turned to study fully the great peculiarities of the Gallican Church with respect to beneficiary matters and particulars of royal jurisdiction; its history and its theories had a great fascination for him, as the alliance of France had for his State in politics. English thought was also of great interest to him. Sir Henry Wotton (envoy to Venice) and Dr. William Bedell (afterwards Bishop of Kilmore) were close friends of his; from the latter indeed Sarpi (himself according to Wotton "one of the humblest things that could be seen within the bounds of humanity") said he had learnt more of theology and practical religion than from anyone else. These things define the positive views taken by Sarpi; negatively his strong dislike to the Jesuits and his abhorrence of the Pope's temporal sovereignty and claims to control over states were equally strong. When the Papacy demanded that Venice should withdraw the law she had passed and asserted that the election of a Doge by excommunicated citizens was invalid, the pride of Venice and her leading adviser (for Sarpi was now theologian adviser to the State) was touched upon the tenderest point. The Pope (April 17th, 1606) solemnly excommunicated all the authorities of Venice if they did not speedily recant; and the territory of the Republic was to be put under a strict interdict. The Doge replied by a proclamation that the Republic owned no superior in temporal powers but God, and that the clergy, regarding the sentence as void, would carry on their cure of souls and worship of God. The papal commands were disregarded except by the Jesuits, Theatines, and Capuchins, and these, unable to obey the State, left the territory for Rome. It was even proposed at Rome

to carry on war against Venice. Had France and Spain been ready, as some of their subjects wished to take sides in it, the war might have happened, and the last interdict of a medieval pattern might have led to a papal war of a similar type. The two great powers, however, mediated. Venice delivered up the ecclesiastics it had tried, and adopted a form of words which the Curia could take as a withdrawal of offensive laws, but she firmly refused to readmit the Jesuits; Spain would not defend the Society, and therefore the Pope yielded the point. A further dispute arose as to the need for absolution, which Venice, not recognising any offence as having been committed, regarded as superfluous. In the end it was privately pronounced. Thus the Papacy was on the whole victorious. But the method of the quarrel, conducted by the Papacy in medieval forms, showed how far and how greatly the world had changed; the dispute, while showing the strength of the Papacy in practice, had called forth a clear assertion of the anti-papal views. The diplomatic triumph was a defeat in the history of continuous thought.

The well-known attempt on Sarpi's life—significant, like the assassinations of the time, of a bad state of morals—involved persons near the Pope, although there are no grounds for accusing him. But Sarpi (himself an advocate of assassination) might feel justified in considering the wound inflicted *stilo Romanæ Curiae*. The other charge, however, against the Pope—which Sarpi himself pressed home and which was generally credited—of unduly enriching his own family, the Borghesi, must be held true.

Paul V. died January 28th, 1621, and Gregory XV.

(Ludovisi), elected (February 9th) as his successor, was too old and infirm for his work and had to leave most of it to his cardinal nephew Ludovico. But he was able to do something for peace in Italy, and uniting France and Spain († July 8th, 1623). His successor, Cardinal Barberini (Urban VIII.), was ardently French in sympathies, partly because he had been a nuncio in France. He was strong and indefatigable, and the objects of his interests were the Church and his family. He more than provided for his own in regard to wealth, and his foundation of the Congregation of Immunities showed his wish to guard the privileges or rights of the Church. But on the whole he owed more to chance than to wisdom. He was swimming in a current of French influence under Richelieu that was stronger than his stroke. War between the Habsburgs and France was inevitable, and Richelieu meant it to be so. The unity within one political league of the Catholics in her communion was no longer possible for Rome, since Richelieu carried to extreme the old French policy of leagues with Protestants against his Catholic rivals. And finally all political rivalries were swallowed up in the Thirty Years' War. The political inclinations of the Pope were now of more importance than the religious. His sympathy with the Emperor, who was doing so much for the restoration of Catholicism, was slight in comparison with what he felt for France in its purely political schemes. Urban would not regard the German War as one for religion, and was unwilling to spend money upon it. Spain protested against

the Pope's indifference and great indignation was professed. The interests of Catholicism were not now sacrificed, it is true, to consideration of the mere Papal States, but to those of wider politics. And the final result of such a policy was that the Papacy was shut out from the Peace of 1648, and its protest against it was useless. No theoretical claims were yielded or withdrawn, but the lessening of its political importance affected the general influence of the Papacy. It was driven back upon purely spiritual weapons, and the restricted area of the Catholic restoration was largely due to the papal policy. The Popes of the earlier Counter-Reformation might have had visions of a world restored to their leadership. To the Popes of the seventeenth century this was impossible, largely because of the mixture of temporal with spiritual aims in the papal policy. Urban VIII., busied not with theological science or ecclesiastical law, but with plans of fortifications and temporal cares; no ascetic, but frankly a man of the world; a temporal ruler above all, in himself typified the change. The spiritual influence of the Counter-Reformation had reached the Papacy, and then seemed to lose its power.

The next Pontificate, that of Innocent X. (Pamfil), illustrates the temporary lessening of papal power. He was elected after a stormy conclave, in **Innocent X.** which the Barberini family made a hard **Sept. 16th,** fight for power, and finally, by an agree- **1644-55.** ment with Spain, agreed upon a choice adverse to France. Feminine quarrels in his family, and the corrupt influence of his sister-in-law, degraded his court. An inquiry into the administration of the

Barberini resulting in heavy fines; small Roman politics upon a background of Italian difficulties and alliances; filled his reign. The Pope was becoming more and more a small Italian sovereign to whose office spiritual duties were annexed.

The attitude of the Church towards learning had in many ways changed. She no longer dreaded the study of classics, and the Jesuits fostered them in schools. The Bible, patristics, and theology were also closely studied. Early Learning. (1507-22) in our period, de Vio (Cardinal Cajetan) had revived instruction on the somewhat neglected Aquinas, and combined with it biblical study, carried out in his commentaries with great freedom of criticism. Afterwards in the middle of the century theological study lapsed. In Ingolstadt after Eck's death (1543) there was only one theological professor, and in Köln theological lectures were discontinued. But the influence of the Jesuits, who as a rule preferred Aquinas to Peter Lombard, revived the study; Petavius, Maldonatus, and Estius were distinguished names amongst them. The great Dominican Melchior Cano (†1560) had systematised the study, and the equally great Jesuit Bellarmine (1542-1621) developed it in a specially controversial sense. Another Jesuit, Cornelius à Lapide, collected patristic interpretations in his commentaries and so popularised them. In a like way ecclesiastical history was studied. Love of the past, as well as the needs of attack and defence, had forced the writers of the *Magdeburg Centuries* to collect material, and their rival Baronius followed suit. The critical insight of all these writers often fell below their good intentions,

and Bellarmine, for instance, had to criticise sharply Baronius in his treatment of records and events. But these writers laid an admirable foundation, and criticism eventually followed collection. The same love of the past was seen in England, notably in the case of Archbishop Parker: a mere enumeration of names, large as it might be made, is of little use, but it is easy to underrate these writers and the work they did.

The study of science lagged far behind that of theology and history. Copernicus (1473–1543) dedicated his work *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium* to Paul III., but his view that **Science.** the sun was the centre of the universe seemed strange and even absurd. Luther thought him a fool. The Congregation of the Index suspended his book until corrected and pronounced his view a contradiction of the Scriptures. Kepler (1571–1630), whose belief in astrology stands in strange contrast to the insight of his celebrated laws, took a step in advance and began a new era. He assumed the theory of Copernicus, but his relations with many theologians, and especially with the Jesuits, were friendly; both when professor at Grätz and when elsewhere he had a great reputation. The Copernican theory itself, however, was still assailed. Galileo Galilei, professor at Padua (1564–1642), attracted much notice by actual observations, and in his published works (1612) he too argued upon the Copernican system, professedly as a hypothesis, but with a real belief in it. The Inquisition condemned the teaching of the system and forbade him to support it. He submitted for a time, but when Urban VIII., a friendly ecclesiastic, became

Pope he once more advocated this hypothesis (1623). A little later he gained the Pope's approval for a scientific dialogue, but the Jesuits now took up the case against him, as the Dominicans had done before. During the process, every detail of which has been discussed in an extensive literature, he abjured the system, but was punished by a loose imprisonment for some years. The dealings of the Church with science have often been unsatisfactory, and in the case of Galileo there were special and general elements that combined to cause difficulty. The general element was the dislike which the Church in its imperfect wisdom has so often shown to novel scientific theories or truths. This spirit has shown itself often and in other cases, and has not been peculiar to the Inquisition. Then to this element were added special elements peculiar to the time and the surroundings. There was a claim made to control investigation and restrain its freedom; this claim was partly founded upon the medieval supremacy of theology, and partly upon the increased rigidity of control caused by the Tridentine reforms. A reconsideration of the relations between theology and other sciences, a wiser limitation of the Church's sphere, might have lessened this special difficulty; but the very hardening and purification of the late reforms made the Church claim with greater insistence, and in fear of results, this wide control of thought. Then too there was the special machinery through which these principles of thought had worked. It was hardly to be looked for that the Roman Church, working through the Index and the Inquisition, should admit a freedom on the part of science which it would not grant

generally. The Index and the Inquisition might plead definite reasons for their existence and might serve some useful ends, but even so much depended upon the spirit that inspired them. Large institutions are called into existence for some definite end; they soon come to consider their working more important than their end and forget their limitations; their action then becomes hurtful. It was so here. The treatment of Galileo forced men of science either to conceal their views or to treat as a tentative hypothesis what they knew to be a truth. Either course led to unreality and to an assumed antagonism between religion and science. After two centuries this position was quietly given up by the Roman authorities. The details of the case, although much discussed, are less important than the principles involved; the latter may have some additional interest as part of the great debate upon papal infallibility, but the advocates of this condemn the judges of Galileo for having treated as definitely closed a theological decision which admitted of reconsideration. But the claim for freedom of thought and investigation raised a wider question than that of infallibility. Theologians erred, as they have often erred, and this weakened their advocacy of the truths they had to guard. The great problem of the Church was how to train, control, and utilise new currents of thought. In many ways she failed to solve the problem. The Council of Trent had wrought many reforms, but it had taken up an attitude which made the correct handling of scientific questions more unlikely than before and less free than in the Middle Ages. The temper of the Roman Church further made it difficult

to abandon this attitude when once it had been taken up, and there was at hand machinery for rapidly and firmly carrying out a decision once taken. The decision thus became of an importance almost critical.

A comprehensive view of the whole period (1509–1648) shows how much depended upon the Popes

and their action. Men in high position,
Summary.

most of all those in high spiritual position, cannot escape moral judgment for the use of their responsibilities. The Popes have often enough fared strangely in this respect. If we regard the Reformation as a movement either hostile to the Papacy or springing up wholly apart from it, it is hard to see how the Popes, differing as they did among themselves, can be blamed for agreement in opposing it. If the great aim of the Reformation as a whole was to overthrow the catholic conception of the Church it was the duty of all who valued that conception to oppose it. But that is surely a narrow and unhistorical view of the Reformation itself. A wide and deep movement in favour of change, seeking to carry out higher ideals and to cast out evils, to read a fuller meaning into old forms of life and to enter into the many-sided heritage of a world that was growing new, this is the movement with which our period began. It was a movement that was general and most of all was found within the Church itself. That in some ways it became hostile to the Church, departed from its unity and created bodies opposed to it, was partly due to errors on the side of those who became leaders of the movement, partly to political causes that intensified division and used it for ignoble ends, but partly at any rate to the leaders of the Church, and to the Popes or

their advisers above all. They failed (as it is so easy for leaders of the Church to fail) to place themselves at the head of a great movement, to direct forces that under wise guidance might have saved the world, but which, wrongly directed, only intensified its evils. The Popes of the Renaissance hardly took life, or even religion, seriously, and it was long before the currents of reform rose to the papal throne. The delayed reform at Trent was the too tardy answer to the call for wise leadership in a Church revived and eager for its work. Historical criticism in these days has risen above the vulgar view which condemns a Pope as such, or for fulfilling the ordinary duties of his position. But it leads us in most cases to a condemnation of a different order. With some exceptions the Popes of the period are condemned not as bad men or faithless priests (for such they were not), but as those who did not rise to the height of their responsibilities, or who fastened their eyes upon an unessential or minor attribute of their office when they should have pursued the great aim placed before them—the deepest, widest spiritual welfare and working efficiency of the Church of Christ. From many charges and imputations impartial criticism may free the Papacy as an institution and the Popes as men. But a higher test remains unsatisfied. It is something to avoid the negation of evil, but that alone is not enough: there must be the highest fulfilment of all possible activities for good.

And the same has to be said of the Church at large. Here again historic criticism casts aside the mere enumeration of abuses as if they were all that existed. We have to recognise the existence of great improvements, to trace out movements for education, reform,

and the cultivation of piety; we meet great social movements and individual types of excellence. The existence in these movements and along with them of serious defects must not blind us to the good they contain. However sad the union may be, we see even in our own days the combination of fanaticism with piety, of intolerance with a high morality; we too mourn separations from the Church and divisions within it. The Church has often had much to learn from those outside her pale, or from those she has been unable to keep to herself, and she can never escape responsibility for those who have left her fold. Combining these considerations, we shall probably form an estimate of the Church during the Reformation very different from that which is popular and current. But even with this estimate we have to admit with sorrow that the Church failed to meet as it should have done all the needs of the age; that it failed to control and guide forces that were capable of mighty good, and which because of their force stood specially in need of guidance. The history of many of those movements which drifted away from the Church, their excellencies and their defects, their possibilities even with their fundamental errors, is the best commentary upon what they missed in not receiving such guidance and upon the failure of the Church in not giving it. The Church must always be judged not only by what it did, but also by what it left undone. It must be measured by its ideal as well as by its deeds. It is a hard judgment, but it is the only possible one to pass upon the Church. The nations should walk in the light of it, and therefore its light should not be dim. The kings of the earth should bring their glory into it,

and therefore its spirit should be purer than theirs. But that was not always the case. It is a heavy responsibility for an age to bear when it has to face the charge of creating separations wider and more fundamental than that between the Eastern and Western Churches—wider because not purely local, more fundamental because of the questions they raised. And yet there seemed something almost accidental in the way in which they were raised; political influences made use of their existence and prolonged it into permanency. Situations badly handled led to estrangements of temper; tempers wrongly indulged were regarded as principles. It is sad to see how politics and policies could eat away the Church's life and sap her strength. To those who see in her mission the salvation of the world it is painful to see errors and evils within her, piety and excellence severed from her or even fighting against her; to see a new division within the Catholic Church, and bodies of men sincerely religious estranged from her. But although the age of the Reformation has its own great sins and shortcomings to answer for, it has its own special difficulties to plead, its own ideals to hold forth. There are currents within the great stream of the Church's life that tend in varied ways. There are tendencies in the lives of men that make for ends that are not their own. Within the Church, and without the Church, the paradox is true, both of her life and the lives of men, testing them in their parts as well as in their whole—" *Qui non est mecum, contra me est.*" " *Qui enim non est adversum vos, pro vobis est.*"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE.—This Bibliography is only intended for the ordinary reader who wishes for guidance upon any part of the period, or for an introductory study of the whole of it. Foreign works are therefore rarely referred to, and, where possible, translations are given. Original records for use by scholars are omitted for the same reason. Complete Bibliographies will be found in the *Cambridge Modern History*, and references upon special points in Möller's *Church History*, as below. Smaller Bibliographies will be found in the books marked †.

A. GENERAL.

Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1902-4). Vol. I. *The Renaissance*, especially chapters vii., ix., xi., xiii., xiv., xvi.-xix. II. *The Reformation*. III. *The Wars of Religion*, especially chapters i., ii., v.-viii., x., xiii., xv.-xvii., xix.-xxii. (especially the Council of Trent in II. and of the Counter-Reformation in III. Vol. IV. appeared too late for use).

Stubbs, *Lectures on European History*. 1904. (Admirable for political history.)

† Dr. W. Möller, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. III., *Reformation to 1648*, edited by Kawerau, translated by Freese. 1900. (Superior to other Church histories.)

† Kurtz's *Church History*, Vols. II. and III. (early part), translated by Macpherson. 1890.

† Alzog's *Universal Church History*, translated by Pabisch and Byrne, Vol. III. Dublin, 1890. (Papal but also fair.)

Lord Acton, *Lectures upon Modern History*. 1906.

Ranke's *History of the Popes*, translated by Austin. (Invaluable.)

Ranke's *History of the Reformation in Germany*. Translated and reprinted. London, 1905. (Best work up to 1535.)

M. Philippon, *Age of the Reformation*, Vol. XI. in the *History of All Nations*. 1902. Also *The Religious Wars*, Vol. XII. in the *History of All Nations*. 1902.

Haüsser's *Period of the Reformation*. Translated. 1885. (A useful summary for Europe.)

† Lavissee et Rambaud, *Histoire Générale*, Vols. IV. and V. Vol. IV. *Renaissance et Réforme*. Vol. V. *Les Guerres de Religion*.

Creighton's *History of the Popes during the Reformation*. (Up to 1527: invaluable: see V. 58-64 for Indulgences.)

Ullmann's *Reformers before the Reformation*. Translated 1855. (For earlier German movements, especially Brethren of the Common Life.)

Hagenbach's *History of the Reformation, chiefly in Germany and Switzerland*. Translated. (Old-fashioned but good.)

† Hergenrother's *Histoire de l'Église*, especially Vol. V. Paris, 1891.

P. Schaff, I. *History of the Creeds of Christendom*. II. *The Greek and Latin Churches*. III. *The Evangelical and Protestant Churches*. 1877. (Useful for documents.)

Kidd, *The Continental Reformation*. (Short but excellent: summarises the doctrinal positions of Reformers clearly.)

Dr. A. W. Ward, *The Counter-Reformation*. 1889. (For the earlier revival, and specially for Germany.)

B. SPECIAL.

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Translated by Waterworth. London, 1848. (With a slight but good history.)

Littledale, *A Short History of the Council of Trent*. (A fairly good account of the Council itself.)

Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* is best used in Courayer's translation (more than one edition).

Pallavicini's *History of the Council* I have used in the Latin Edition of Antwerp, 1673.

Mendham's *Memoirs of the Council of Trent* (London, 1834) contains much good matter along with a bad commentary.

Jervis, *History of the Church of France*, Vol. I. London, 1872.

Ranke's *Französische Geschichte*. Partly translated as *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*. 2 vols., London, 1852.

Armstrong, *The French Wars of Religion*.

S. R. Gardiner, *The Thirty Years War*.

Gindely, *The Thirty Years War*. Translated. 2 vols., London, 1885.

T. B. Willson, *History of Church and State in Norway from the Tenth to Sixteenth Century*. 1903.

For the History of Missions, Henrion, *Histoire générale des Missions Catholiques*. Paris, 1846-7,

Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World* and *The Jesuits in North America*.

The History of the American Church, by Bishop Coleman. 1903.

Hore's *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church* (Parker, 1899).

Also Blackmore's translation of Mouravieff's *History of the Church of Russia* (Oxford, 1842).

Blackmore's *Doctrine of the Russian Church* (Rivingtons, 1845).

Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church: Patriarchate of Alexandria*, Vol. II. (Parker, 1847).

Much that is useful may still be found in Krasinski, *Lectures on the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations* (London, 1869), and the same writer's *Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland* (2 vols., London, 1838-40).

Scandinavia is treated of in chapter xvii. of the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II.

For Sweden, Geiger's *Geschichte Schwedens* is good. (Translated 1847.)

C. BIOGRAPHIES.

† *Erasmus*, Lives by Emerton (Putnam, 1899) and Drummond (2 vols., Smith, Elder, and Co., 1873).

Martin Luther. By Köstlin, 1900; by Jacobs, 1898; † by Lindsay, 1900.

† *Zwingli*. By Jackson, 1901. For Zwingli I may refer to my article in the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II., with its Bibliography.

Sir Thomas More, by W. H. Hutton. 1900.

Cranmer, by A. J. Mason. 1898.

John Knox and the Reformation, by Andrew Lang. 1905. (A reaction against the indiscriminate praise of Knox.)

Laul, by W. H. Hutton.

Henry VIII., by Pollard.

† *The Emperor Charles V.*, by E. Armstrong. (More than a biography and very useful for the history.)

S. Francis de Sales and *The Revival of Priestly Life in the Seventeenth Century in France*, by Sidney Lear.

Life of Cardinal Ximenes, by Hefele. Translated 1860.

Full information as to Biographies is to be found in Möller, under the different headings.

D. HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

† *History of the English Church*, Vols. IV., V., and VI., by James Gairdner, W. H. Frere, and W. H. Hutton.

Dixon's *History of the English Church*, Vols. I.-VI. (Admirable and full from 1529 to 1603.)

Gardiner's *History of England*, 1603-42, and *History of the Great Civil War*, 1642-9. (The most important works on the period.)

Blunt's *Reformation of the Church of England*. (Very good.)

Gasquet's *Eve of the Reformation; Old English Bible and other Essays*. His *Dissolution of the Monasteries*, although excellent, does not add much to Dixon's account.

Frere, *The Marian Reaction*. 1896.

For the reign of Elizabeth, Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion*, 1558-64. (Most important.)

W. A. Shaw's *History of the English Church*, 1640-60. (For the documentary history.)

Wakeman's *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*. (Needs no commendation now.)

For Scotland, Lang's *History of Scotland*, Vols. I.-III. 1900-4.

The History of Doctrine in England is best taken with the Thirty-nine Articles. *The Thirty-nine Articles*, by Gibson, and more concisely by Kidd (Rivingtons' Oxford Church Text Books).

The Prayer Book is best treated by Procter and Frere; but reference should also be made to Bishop and Gasquet, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* (1890).

Upon Anglican Orders, Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*; and Denny, *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*.

E. DOCTRINE.

Upon the History of Doctrine generally, Harnack's *History of Dogma* (Vol. VII.), although it is sweeping and emphatic, and lays too much stress upon Luther, is the most illuminating.

Ritschl's *History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*. (The original first volume translated 1872: the best history for the medieval and Protestant doctrines, but does not treat of later Roman doctrine.)

Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum*, Vol. I., especially Part II. (Invaluable: establishes Luther's lack of doctrinal

originality and his inaccuracy in sketching his own development.)

In the Rev. C. Bodington's *Books of Devotion*, chapters x.-xiii. 1903.

The *Spiritual Exercises* of S. Ignatius Loyola are reproduced in English as *Manresa* (Burns, 1860).

Melanchthon's *Loci Communes Theologici* (in many editions) is the best handbook of Lutheran theology.

Among articles in magazines to which (along with others) I have been indebted I wish to mention: Miss A. M. Tucker, in the *English Historical Review*, XVIII., 24, 266, 439, upon *Giberti*; Prof. Maitland, *Elizabethan Gleanings*, in the same, XV., 20, 324, 530, 757, XVIII., 517; the Rev. W. H. Hutton in the same upon *The Religious Writings of Sir Thomas More*, IV., 667; and also in the *Quarterly* for October, 1905, upon *Erasmus*; and the Rev. J. N. Figgis, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. II., pp. 66 seq., upon *Erastus and Erastianism*; Mr. James Gairdner, in the *English Historical Review*, *New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII.* (XI., 673 on; XII., 1 on and 237); René Ancel, in the *Révue des Questions Historiques*, April, 1906, on *La Secrétaire Pontificale sous Paul IV.*; R. Maere, *Les Origines de la Nonciature de Flandre*, in the *Révue d'Histoire ecclésiastique*, July, 1906; P. Richard, *Origines des Nonciatures permanentes*, in *Révue d'Histoire ecclésiastique*, January and April, 1906.

Among books to which I am indebted are:—

Philippson's *La Contre-Révolution*. 1884.

Janssen's *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit den Ausgang des Mittelalters*, as revised by Pastor. 1897–1903. (The earlier volumes only translated. Invaluable for the whole period.)

Pastor's *History of the Popes since the Reformation*. In English, by Antrobus, 1898, etc.

Maurenbrecher's *Karl V. und die deutschen Protestanten*

(1545-55); his *Geschichte der katholischen Reformation* (1880), unhappily never finished; and his *Studien und Skizzen*.

Die Selbstbiographie des Cardinals Bellarmin, by Döllinger and Reusch (Bonn, 1887); the same authors' *Geschichte den Moralstreitigkeiten in den römisch-katholischen Kirche* (Nördlingen, 1889 on).

Moritz Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, Vol. I. (Gotha, 1880).

Gothein, *Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation* (Halle, 1895).

Religion und Kirche in England im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert, by Dr. E. Fueter (Mohr, 1904).

Döllinger's *Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient* (2 vols., Nördlingen, 1876) I have also used largely, along with many other German works and collections on the same subject.

Also many articles and references in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* and the *Révue d'Histoire ecclésiastique*.

NOTE

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.—As the medieval doctrine is often misunderstood, and as the different views then taken make it misleading to speak (as is often done) of one consistent medieval view, it seemed well to add a short note with the Bibliography. Whatever interpretation be given to S. Augustine's teaching, and perhaps it is not always consistent, he laid unique stress upon (a) God's sovereignty and free grace ; (b) a change of life in man. Justification deals with the relation between God and man ; hence it is fundamentally connected with the Incarnation of Christ, with its effects (if one can so speak reverently) upon God Himself, and its effects upon the sinner. Here is room for two opposite kinds of treatment. The same relation is also closely connected with Regeneration, which places man in a new corporate relation to God, and with Sanctification, by which he grows nearer to God in thought and deed. A difference of view would also arise according as each of these terms is held to imply one definite act or (more rightly) a process. Salvation, again, may be regarded as a definite end or as a process. Here again there is much room for divergency. It may be said at once that the medieval theologians connected Justification with Regeneration—the entrance into the divine society with all its attendant duties and privileges. Luther, on the other hand, rather regarded Sanctification as a state of holiness than as a continued process. The medieval Catholic view thus laid stress upon life in the Church with its sacramental life and its growth in grace—salvation, or "the being saved" ("a state of salvation"), as a process. Luther, on the other hand, regarded salvation as a gift given once for all, conferred with Justification.

The history of the doctrine may be given shortly as follows : S. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo?* brought in a new conception of the sinner's reconciliation with God by Christ's death regarded as a

legal transaction. From this work one leading line of opinion was derived. Abelard was the founder of another school; he made the reconciliation of the sinner with God depend upon the moral disposition towards each other of the two parties in the reconciliation. His conception was mainly ethical, while that of S. Anselm was mainly legal; but Abelard's conception easily lent itself to abuse through its possibly lower view of God's grace. According to Abelard, God's condescension to man by the sending of Christ, and Christ's surrender of Himself to death, awaken in man a bond of love towards God, and this is the ground for the forgiveness of man's sin. S. Anselm's theory, which was far from being so dominant in the Middle Ages as is often supposed, applied to all mankind, while Abelard's applied only to the elect.

In these views two conceptions are to be distinguished: Christ's merit which passes on to man, and His satisfaction rendered to God. Peter Lombard (followed by later medieval writers) developed the idea of Christ's merit and rather suppressed that of His satisfaction. He further developed the legal conception, but he also enlarges the idea of redemption from the power of the devil, which comes about by Christ's death awakening in us a love of Him which extinguishes sin. Upon this side he follows Abelard. The view of S. Thomas Aquinas is more important, and if perhaps incomplete in itself, yet recognises all these factors, and also that of satisfaction. But he too lays most stress upon the idea of Christ's merit, although he also speaks of the love of Christ awakening love in us. Thus in his teaching the two ideas of (a) Christ's satisfaction rendered to God and (b) the merit of Christ's sacrifice are insisted upon. But his whole conception starts with the grace of God working in us. And the grace works in the sphere of Christ's Church. It is not going too far to say that the reformers, on the other hand, started with the idea of a moral external law which has to be satisfied, and was satisfied by Christ.

The conception of Duns Scotus, differing in some elements, yet came to much the same result as that of Aquinas. But Duns made the Incarnation of Christ only of use to the elect, and also independent of the fall of man and not intended (as in the debased Puritan conception popularised by Milton) merely

as an after-thought to the fall. So he did not consider the sufficiency of Christ's death (which extended to all the world) to exceed its efficiency (which only covered the elect); he made the two equivalent, both affecting the elect only. Aquinas made Christ's sufferings be borne by Him as the Head of the Church; Duns rather regarded them as being borne by Him as an individual. The many and varied elements in the medieval doctrine can thus be seen, and a varying stress might be laid upon any one element. But it cannot be too strongly insisted upon that its statement always involved the idea of God's grace, and that it recognised the facts of life, and above all the existence of Christ's body upon the earth. The doctrine is apt to become colourless and to lose its vast significance in relation to the corporate life, if the living union of the believer with Christ is made a purely individual concern apart from life in the Church. Justification in the medieval view means that God by His grace makes righteous the unrighteous man. God's grace and man's activity are united. According to Aquinas, the habitual grace implanted in man by God's gracious act is Justification. To a sinner this is wrought through forgiveness of sin, and involves it. With Duns, on the other hand, the forgiveness of sins is treated as being less important; he lays more stress upon the idea of man's activity.

A further complication was brought in by the Nominalists, who made merit *de congruo* have a value in itself towards gaining *gratiam primam*, or the first gift of grace. With their mere purely human view of everything the Nominalists asserted the efficacy of human merit. Hence came endless discussions which had this in common, that they exalted man's power at the expense of God's grace. Thus they obscured the idea of God's grace, they lessened the significance of sin, and in both ways departed from the medieval Catholic position.

It has been shown most clearly by Denifle that Luther's interpretation of the "righteousness" or "justice of God" (Rom. i. 17) was not novel. Luther depicts himself as depressed by understanding "the justice" here to mean "the formal or active justice" by which God punishes sinners, this being, as he says, the current interpretation. Then it came into his mind that it meant rather the "passive" justice by which God communicates His own

righteousness to man, and he became happy ("the just shall live by faith"). A series of citations given by Denifle show, however, (1) that Luther's predecessors had taken this view, which he describes as novel, and (2) that he himself in his commentary upon Romans had made the fullest use of their works and shared their view before this supposed change in his opinions. Intentional untruth on Luther's part might be supposed, but a preferable explanation is defective memory and the difficulty of correctly describing one's past and one's development over a distance of changing years.

Ritschl, in the work mentioned on p. 461 (which is largely used in this note), protests vigorously against describing any theologian, who lays stress upon the grace of God or the need of faith upon the part of man, as a "Reformer before the Reformation." He is, I think, hardly fair to the German mystics, with whom the school of Ritschl and Harnack have little sympathy, but this protest is undoubtedly right (see Ritschl, pp. 99-120).

The doctrine of Justification before the Reformation was not so simple, certainly not so corrupt and foolish, as it is sometimes stated or assumed to be. Scholastics and Reformers had a different basis: medieval theologians assumed the Church, the corporate life; the Reformers, on the other hand, were much more individualistic, if not purely so. What was excellent in the teaching of the Reformers was the stress laid upon God's grace and man's sinfulness; here they reaffirmed the best elements of the medieval teaching—elements which the Nominalist teaching and the abuses of indulgences had overlaid. What was defective in the Reformers' teaching was the neglect of the corporate life and the separation of faith from life itself. The Tridentine Decree endeavours to recognise, if not adequately, yet in some degree, all these elements. The Reformation shifted the point of view, as may be seen not only in Lutheranism and Calvinism, but in the Anglican Article XI.; in discussing any view—S. Paul's, the medieval, the Tridentine, the Anglican, or the Reformers'—both the point of view and the balance of the details, should be considered. Nothing but harm is done by the isolation of parts of a statement from the whole. In doctrine so much depends upon the point of view and the context of an

assertion. Luther, for instance, enlarged S. Paul's "justification by faith" into "justification by faith *alone*": taken along with the dangerous assertion that man's salvation depended upon his own conviction of its truth this expression became mischievous. But taken by itself as a reaction against the importance assigned to works it might be merely a strong assertion of the supremacy of God's grace as against works, and further, it rightly lifted the whole process from the sphere of man's activity into that of spirituality. But, like the assertion of salvation by works, it was too likely to limit its view to man and man's own view of his position, for it made man's feelings the central point, hence in the end it shut out the conception of God and His grace which it was originally meant to emphasise; this result was hastened by the disregard of life within the Church; united to individualism the phrase became licentious, and, as a party badge under other conditions when it was not necessary to insist upon the subordination of works, the phrase lost all value. The Anglican Article XI. adopts the Lutheran phrase, but uses it in the proper sense stated above, viz. that of an emphatic contradiction of salvation by works, upon which Article XII. enlarges. The Anglican Articles start from the Reformation point of view, and assert the primitive doctrine in the light of Reformation controversies. Their caution is seen in their brevity and in their omission of all but essential points; they leave aside medieval speculation and Protestant theories. The Tridentine Decree, on the other hand, is cautious in its fulness of balanced statement and in its attempt to express all that was true in medieval theology while condemning Protestant novelties. But to reach this end and yet to satisfy all parties in the Council was very hard. In the text I have used the term "the mediating theologians" to describe the school of Pflug and Gropper. Their view, however, was not really formed by a combination of that of the Reformers and of the medieval Catholic Church, but by a reassertion of elements found in the medieval view itself; these elements—broadly the assertion of God's grace and the sinfulness of man—they asserted with limitations and conditions disregarded by the German Reformers. The Jesuit view, which emphasised a side of the doctrine forgotten by the Reformers—the need of righteousness on man's part and the existence of

his free will—might be derived either from the Catholic medieval view or from the Nominalist statements. But here again the truth it embodied was liable to exaggeration, and could easily suffer from the non-presentation of other elements along with it.

[This note is meant to be taken along with the statements in the text, and I should like to refer to an admirable note in Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary upon Romans*, p. 147 *seq.* Field, *Of the Church*, Book III, Appendix: Chapter XI. is also useful.]

INDEX

- Aachen, 291
 ,, religious troubles at (1581), 295
 Abbot, Archbishop (and Eastern Church), 417
 Abelard on Justification, 465
 Abuses, ecclesiastical (fifteenth century), 6, 15
 ,, demand for reform of (*see* Trent), 81
 Abyssinia, 422-3
 Acadia, 427
 Adam of Usk on Rome, 321
 Adiaphoristic controversy, 289
 Advertisements (1566), 361, 362
 Affinity, spiritual, 226
 Agnes von Mansfeld, 294
 Agricola, John, and Interim, 116
 Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mainz and Brandenburg, 31, 56
 Albert V. of Bavaria, 303
 ,, and the Jesuits, 283
 Alcala (University), 274, 282
 Aleander, 37
 Alexander VI. *See* Popes
 ,, of Saxony, a pluralist bishop, 293
 Alexandria, Patriarchs of, 413, 416-17, 422-3
 Alexius, Czar, 419-20
 Altemps, Cardinal d', 175, 212
 Alva in the Netherlands, 379-80
 Ambassadors at Trent, 165, 188, 190, 232
 Ambassadors at Trent (not signing Decrees), 249
 Ambrose, S. (edited by Sixtus V.), 435
 America, Spanish rule in, 387, 424-7
 Amsdorf consecrated Bishop of Naumburg by Luther, 288
 Amyot, 153
 Anabaptists, 50-1, 52
 ,, (Switzerland), 73-4
 ,, (Munster), 74
 ,, (Netherlands), 377
 Andreae, Jacob, 414
 Andrewes, Bishop, 374
 Andrews, S. (a Province, 1472), 347, 348
 Angermannus, Archbishop, 401
 Anglican doctrine of Justification, 467-8
 Anhalt, 54, 56, 83-4, 121, 292
 ,, Wolfgang of, 60
 ,, Christian of, 305, 308
 Anhausen, Protestant Union at, 307
 Annates, 20, 236, 334-5
 ,, (Poland), 405
 Anne, S., cult of, 7
 Annecy, 272
 Ansbach (*see* also Brandenburg), 58, 83, 291-2
 Antioch (Patriarchate), 422
 Appeals in Church cases, 158
 Aquaviva, 390-1, 397
 Aquinas, S. Thomas, 4
 ,, doctrines of (Thomism), 391
 ,, study of (*see* *Ratio Studiorum*), 448
 ,, on Justification, 131-3, 465-6
 Archpriest controversy, 284
 Armada (and Sixtus V.), 437

- Arminius, 382-4
 Arminianism, 384-5
 Arras (diocese), 376, 378
 Articles (Six), 344-5
 " (Ten), 342-3
 " (Thirty-nine), 362
 " (Lambeth), 369
 " (or Remonstrance—Netherlands), 384
 Arze, John de (and Breviary of Quignon), 254
 Assyrian Christians, 422
 Augsburg, Diet of (1530), 79-81
 " " (1547-8), 116
 " " (1555), 119
 " " (1582), 295
 " Confession of, 79-80, 182, 207
 " Confession of, Jeremiah II. upon, 415
 " Religious Peace of, 120, 286
 " Religious Peace of (its difficulties), 295, 300
 " Religious Peace of (and Edict of Restitution), 311
 " Interim, 149, 400
 " (and emigration to England), 348
 " See of, 297-8
 " (Lutherans and Calvinists at), 290
 Augustine, S. (influence upon Calvin), 99
 " (and Justification), 132, 133, 464
 Augustinianism, 132 *seq.*, 389
 Augustinian Friars (*see* von Staupitz), 8
 " " (in Germany), 43
Augustinus (Suarez), 136
 Austria, Protestants in, 121
 Austrian lands, Reformation in, 299
 Austrian lands, Counter-Reformation in, 302-3, 305, 310
 Authority and thought, 154
Auxilii, de (Congregation), 136, 440
 Baden, 292, 317
 Bajus, 135
 Baldwin, F., 396
 Balthasar Gravel, Abbot of Fulda, 296
 Bamberg, 297, 314
 Bancroft, Archbishop, 369
 Baptism, Holy. *See* Trent
 Baptists in England, 363
 Barberini, 429, 446, 448
 Barcelona, 274
 " Treaty of, 55, 58
 Barmama, Simeon, 422
 Barnabites, the, 9
 Baronius, 255, 267, 441, 449
 " (*Annales*), 267
 Bartholomew, Massacre of S., 103
 Basel, 27, 72, 97
 Basilides, 423
 Bassi, Matteo de (and Capuchins), 264-5
 Bathory, Stephan (Poland), 409-10
 Bavaria, religion in, 45, 303
 " policy of house of, 82
 " Protestantism in, 121
 " demands of estates, 304
 " in Thirty Years War, 305-6, 317
 Baxter, 383
 Beaton, Cardinal, 348
 Beatus, Rhenanus, 175
 Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, and Sarpi, 444
 Belgium, 379-80
 Belgic Confession, 382
 Bellarmine, 258, 393, 396, 448-9
 Bellay, Eustace du, Bishop of Paris, 282
 Benedictines, the, 8
 " " in Italy, 9
 " " French, 267-8
 Benefices (*see* Trent), 19, 38, 41, 163
 Berard, Bishop of Camerino, 409
 Bermudez, John, 422
 Bern, Reformation at, 69-70, 98
 Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar, 314
 Bérulle, Cardinal, 267, 269-70
 Beza, Theodore, at Poissy, 102

- Bible, study of, 11, 448
 „ in Eastern Church, 419-20
 „ in English, 343, 345, 351
 „ translation in Germany before Luther, 8
- Bishops under Henry VIII. (appointment of), 335, 339
 „ under Edward VI. (appointment of), 350
 „ under Mary, 356, 367
 „ under Elizabeth (and appointment of), 360
 „ under Mary (in Ireland), 371-2
 „ in Scotland, 364
 „ 186-8
 „ and the Curia, 20, 21
 „ authority of, 164
 „ confirmation of, 227
 „ in Denmark, 92-3
 „ residence of. *See* Trent
 „ titular, 144, 216-17
 „ types of, 4
- Bishops' Book (Institution, etc.), 343
- Blackwell, 393
- Bobadilla, 283
- Bohemia, 56
 „ Lutheranism in, 299
 „ Emperor Rudolf and, 305, 307
 „ Ferdinand of Styria in, 308, 310
 „ expulsion of Protestants from, 310-11
- Bohemian Brethren, 299, 305
 „ „ in Poland, 404, 407-8
- Boleyn, Anne, 328, 335-6
- Bologna, 281
 „ Concordat of, 94
- Bona Sforza (Poland), 404
- Bonner, Bishop of London, 350
 „ removed, 353
- Borghese (and Borghesi), 429, 441, 445
- Boris Godonof, Russia, 413
- Borgia. *See* Alexander VI.
 „ Cesare, 3
- Borgia, Francis (D. of Gandia, Jesuit General), 282, 390
- Borromeo, Cardinal Carlo, 72, 173, 206, 211, 250, 258, 265, 268-9
- Borromeo, Cardinal Carlo, and Sarpi, 443
- Borromeo, Cardinal Carlo, Oblates of, 268
- Bossuet, 271
- Both kinds, reception of (*see* Chalice), 193
- Brandenburg (*see also* Ansbach), 121, 291-2
 „ religious changes in, 115
 „ Albert of, 119
 „ Elector of, 54
 „ Joachin II., 115
 „ Margrave of, 60
 „ and secularised sees, 292-3, 316
 „ bishopric of, 292
- Brietenfeld, battle of (1631), 313
- Bremen, bishopric of, 83, 293, 309, 316
- Bresce, Synods of, 410
- Brès, de, 382
- Breviary, 440
 „ history of Roman, 252-5
 „ of Quignon, 253
 „ and Pius V., 433
 „ local forms of, 254
 „ Sarum, 327, 345
- Brignonet, Bishop of Meaux, 95
- Briefs, Secretaryship of, 432
- Bristol, *see* of, 338
- Brunau (before the Thirty Years War), 307-8
- Bruns, Anton, Archbishop of Prague, 199
- Brunswick (*see also* Lüneburg), 54, 83, 121, 292
 „ and secularised sees, 316
 „ Duke Henry of, 113
- Bucer, 77, 80, 109, 114
- Buddæus, 396
- Bugenhagen, 91
- Bull, *Aeternus ille*, 259
 „ *Benedictus Deus* (1564), 250

- Bull, *In Cæna Domini* (1527), 183, 433
 „ *In eminenti* (1642), 136
 „ *Injunctum nobis*, 261
 „ *In sacrosancti beatis Petri*, 261
 „ *Quod a nobis*, 254
 „ *Regnans in excelsis*, 367
 „ *Zelo Domus Dei* (1648), 318
 Buoncompagni (*see* Gregory XIII.), 434, 436
 Bursfeld, 8
 Busch, 8
- Cajetan, Cardinal (de Vio), 21, 33, 448
 Calasanze, Joseph, 270
 Calendar, reform of, by Gregory XIII., 435
 „ adopted by States, 435
 Calinio, Archbishop of Zara, 254, 257
 Calvin, 93, 97-101, 109, 382
 „ early life and travels, 97
 „ at Geneva, 98-9
 „ his Institutes, 97-8
 „ at Oxford, 368
 „ doctrines of, 99
 „ organisation of, 100-1, 363, 382-3
 „ his influence, 101
 Calvinism, Crypto, 289
 „ in England, 368-70
 „ in Scotland, 363, 366
 „ in Germany not tolerated by Religious Peace, 120
 „ in Germany, nor by Edict of Restitution, 311
 „ in Germany, nor by Peace of Prague, 315
 „ in Germany tolerated by Treaty of Westphalia, 317
 „ policy leads to Thirty Years War, 305-6
 and Lutheranism, divisions between, 77, 288-9, 290, 291
- Calvinism in Netherlands, 377, 381-3
 „ in Netherlands (their Scholasticism), 385
 „ in Poland, 404-5
 Cambrai, League of (1508), 16
 „ Treaty of (1529), 58
 „ diocese, 376
 Cammin, bishopric of, 293, 316
 Camoldolites, the, 9, 264
 „ „ (Peter Damiani) 264
 Campeggio, 329
 Canada, rarity of divorce in, 224
 „ French-Canadian Church, 428
 „ missions in, 427-8
 Canisius, 185, 213, 295
 „ at Ingolstadt and Vienna, 283
 „ Catechism or *Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ*, 284
 „ *Catechism*, 257
 „ Catechism in Sweden, 400
 „ favours Quignon's Breviary, 300
 Cano, Melchior, 386, 448
 Canons (1571) (England), 361
 „ (1640) (England), 371
 Canon Law in England, 321, 333, 339
 Canonists and Theologians, opposition between, 178
 Canterbury, new position of Archbishop after Reformation, 339
 Canterbury, Archbishops of. *See* Warham, Cranmer, Pole, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Abbot, Bancroft, Laud
 Capito, 80
 Capuchins, the, 9, 72, 265
 „ „ on Peace of Prague, 315
 „ „ in Switzerland, 269
 Caraffa, 126, 266, 435
 „ (Nuncio in Germany), 310
 „ and Jesuits, 275
 „ *See* Paul IV.

- Cardinal Superintendent, 432
 Cardinal Superintendent, College of (*see also* Conclaves), 227, 231, 434, 438
 Cardinal Superintendent, College of, its reform, 231
 Cardinal Superintendent and Congregations, 434
 Carinthia, 303, 305
 Carlstadt, 34, 42, 50, 74-6
 Carga, Giovanni, memoir on the Curia, 431-2
 Carranza, Bartolomé de, Archbishop of Toledo (his trial), 236-7, 436
 Carlos, Don, 300
 Carniola, 303, 305
 Cartwright, Thomas, 363
 Carvajal, Cardinal, 17
 Casas, Las (and slavery), 426-7
 Casaubon (in England), 374, 389
 Cassander, George, 302, 399
 ,, *Consultatio* of, 302, 399
 Castagna (Urban VII.), 439
 Castel (on Synods), 159
 Casuistry, study of, general, 396
 Câteau Cambresis (1559), Treaty of, 167
 Catechism of Trent, 229, 257-8
 ,, of Trent (*see also* Canisius), 283, 284
 ,, of Bellarmine, 258
 ,, Racovian (Poland), 408
 ,, Dominicans and Jesuits differ on, 258
 ,, of Heidelberg, 290
 ,, of Mogilas, 418
 Catholic reaction, 121-2
 Catholicism, restoration of, along Rhine, 116
 ,, restoration of, in Germany, 294-9
 ,, restoration of, in Austrian lands, 310-11
Centum Gravamina (Germany), 18
 Centuries, the Magdeburg, 448
 Cervini (*see* Marcellus II.), 127
 Chablais, 272
 Chalice, mixed, 154-5, 191-4, 196, 198, 199, 202, 214, 215
 ,, administration of (Austrian lands), 299, 303
 ,, administration of (Bavaria), 303
 ,, administration of (England), 351
 ,, *See also* Communion in both kinds
 Chaldaea, Uniat Church of, 422
 Champlain, 427
 Chantries, 349, 350
 Chapters, Cathedral. *See* Trent
 ,, Cathedral reform of, 200-1, 229, 234
 ,, Cathedral, visitation of, 244
 ,, Cathedral, degeneracy of, 293
 Charity, Brothers of, 270
 ,, ,,, Confraternity of, 271
 ,, Sisters of, founded, 271
 Charles V., Emperor (I. of Spain):
 at Worms, 37
 and a Council, 54, 112, 148-9
 sack of Rome, 55
 and Lutheranism, 58, 115
 and Pope, 140, 148-9, 151, 161
 crowned, 58
 his Interim of Augsburg, 116, 148
 a fugitive before Maurice, 119
 war with France, 126
 abdication of, 168
 position in Spain and Empire, 167
 and Mary of England, 355
 and slavery, 426
 in Netherlands, 376, 378, 386
 and Jesuits, 338
 Charles I. (England), 366
 ,, Duke of Styria, 303
 ,, IX. (of Sweden), 401-2
 Chastel, Jean, 393
 Cherubini (Bellarmine), 436
 Chester, *See* of, 338

- Christgarten, 305
 Christian of Anhalt, 305
 ,, I. of Denmark, 85
 ,, II. of Denmark, 85, 86, 89
 ,, IV. of Denmark (Duke of Holstein), 309, 310
 ,, William of Brandenburg as bishop, 293
 ,, Civic League (*Bürgerrecht*), 70, 71
 ,, Union, 70
 Christina (Sweden), 402
 Church, of England (*see* England, Church of):
 definition of Augsburg Confession, 79
 and science, 450
 and Reformation movement, 453
 and its failures and successes, 454-5
 and learning, 448
 and State (*see* also Reformation of Princes), 245
 Church lands in Bohemia, disputes as to, 307
 Church, Minor Reformed (Poland), 408
 Chytraeus, 302
 Cisneros, Dom Garcia de, 274
 Cities and Reformation, 430
 Civil War in England, 371
 Claudius (Abyssinia), 422
 Clement VII., 265, 329, 336
 ,, VIII. and Congregation *de Auxiliis*, 136
 ,, VIII. and Index, 183
 Clerical marriage. *See* Libels of Reformation, England, Zurich, Luther
 Clerical marriage, 399, 415
 ,, in Bavaria, 304
 Clergy in Poland, 405
 ,, privileges of, in Poland, 405
 ,, submission of, 333
 Cleve, Duchy of, succession to, 113, 291, 305
 ,, , Reformation in, 114
 ,, , Duke William of, 114
 Coadjutor bishops, 240
Codex Alexandrinus, 417
 Cochlaeus, 52, 109
 Coelde, Dietrech, 8
 Cognac, League of (1526), 53
 Colet (Dean of S. Paul's), 25, 327
 Coligny, Admiral, 103
 Colleges of Jesuits (*see* Seminaries, Trent), 281-4
Collegium Urbanum, 423
 Colonies:
 English, 421
 Spanish, 421, 424-7
 French, 421, 427-8
 Commendone (Bishop of Zante), 409
 Common Life, Brethren of the, 10-11, 25, 377
 Communion in both kinds, 114
 England, 350
 Sweden, 409
 (*See* Trent and Chalice)
 Communion, Holy, changes in England, 350-1
Complutensian Polyglot, 14
 "Compromise, the," in Netherlands, 379
 Conclaves for Papal elections, 438-9, 440-1, 447
 ,, and Reform, 125-6, 172
 Concord of Wittenberg, 77
 ,, Formula of, 289, 292
 ,, (in Poland), 408
 Concordat with Spain, (1482), 13
 ,, with France, 20
Confessio Tetrapolitana, 80
 Confession of Augsburg, 79-80, 182, 207
 Confession of Augsburg, Eastern Church on, 414-15
 Confession of Augsburg, Confutation, 80
 Confession of Augsburg adopted by Sweden, 401
 Confession, Belgic, 382
 ,, of Cyril Lucar, 417
 ,, Second Helvetic, 100, 289
 ,, Orthodox, 1640 (*see* also Consensus), 418

- Confession, Sacramental. *See* Trent
 „ Saxon (1551), adopted by Union in Poland, 407
 „ Westminster, 383
 Confessions in the East, 418
 Confirmation. *See* Trent
 „ of Bishops. *See* Trent
 Congregation *de Auxiliis*, 136
 „ of Council of Trent, 250
 „ *De Propaganda Fide*, 423
 „ for Germany (under Gregory XIII.), 301
 „ of the Index, 185
 Congregationalists in England, 363
 Congregations, 434, 437, 446
 Congruity, doctrine of, 136, 390
 Consensus of Sandomir, 407, 408
 „ Tigurinus (1549), 100, 289
 Consilium delectorum, etc., *de emendanda ecclesia*, 125
 Constantinople (Patriarch of), 412, 414, 416
 „ Jesuits in, 417
 „ English diplomacy, 417
 „ Synod of, 417
 Constanzt, 60, 64-5, 72, 80, 175, 394
 Consultatio of Cassander, 399
 Consultation of Hermann of Köln, 352
 Contarini, 108, 109, 126, 253, 266
 Conventuals, the (*see* Franciscans), 8
 „ and Observants, 265
 Convocation (England), 333-4, 350-1
 „ and Prayer Book, 352
 Copenhagen, Decree of, 91
 Copernicus, his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cælestium*, 449
 Copts of Abyssinia, 422-3
 Cornia, Ascanio della, 168
 Corpus Evangelicorum (projected), 314
 Cortes (under Charles V.), 13
 Coton, Friar, 393, 394
 Council under Edward VI., 349
 „ *See* Lateran, Pisa, Trent
 Councils, the great Western, 4-5, 7, 12
 Counter-Reformation :
 True view of, 11
 In Germany, 121-2
 In Sweden, 402
 In Poland, 409, 410
 (*See* also Catholicism, restoration of)
 Cour, Didier de la, 267
 Courts, ecclesiastical, in Poland, 405-7. *See* also Ecclesiastical Procedure, Trent
 „ ecclesiastical, in England, 321
 Covenant in Scotland, 364
 Cranmer (*Reformatio Legum*), 333, 336, 339-41, 345, 350-1
 „ and Black Rubric, 354, 355
 „ his martyrdom, 356
 „ compared to Cyril Lucar, 416
 “Creatures,” Papal, 438
 Creed of Pope Pius IV., 261
 „ Nicene, at Trent, 129
 Crépy (1544), Peace of, 112, 126
 Crescenzo, Cardinal of S. Marcello, Legate at Trent, 151, 165, 207
 Criminous Clerks, 195, 244
 Critopoulos, Metrophanes, 417
 Cromwell, Thomas, 337
 Crusades, tax for, 20
 Crusius, 414
 Cruzada (Spanish), 239
 Cujus regio, ejus religio, 55, 120
 „ „ „ in Poland, 409
 Culm, Bishop of. *See* Hosius

- Curia, 40
 „ organisation of, 430, 431-2
 „ parties in (*see* Conclaves), 441
 „ reform of, under Adrian VI., 40
 „ reform of, under Paul III., 109
 „ reform of, under Pius IV., 189
 Curialists, 21, 177
 „ *See* Papacy, Trent
 Cusa, Nicholas of (Krebs), 10
 Cyril of Bercea, 417-18
 „ Lucar, 416-17
 Czar, title of, taken by Ivan IV., 412
 D'Achery, 268
 Danzig, 403
 David, King (Abyssinia), 422
 Decrees of Trent, public acceptance of, 243
 „ „ commended to princes, 248-9
 „ „ acceptance by nations, 251
 „ (Tridentine) on Reform, effect of, 220
 Delfino, 191
 Demetrius (Russia), 413
 „ the false, 414-15
 Denmark and *Formula of Concord*, 292
 Denmark, Kings of:
 Christian I., 85
 „ II., 85, 86, 89
 Frederick I., 90-1
 Christian III., 91
 Denmark, 85, 86, 89
 „ Reformation in, 90
 „ Lutheran organisation in, 92
 Denifle on Luther, 466-7
 Dessau, League at, 54
 Deventer, 25
Deutsche Theologie, 28
Devout Life, Introduction to (S. Francis de Sales), 272
 Diet. *See* Augsburg, Nürnberg, Regensburg, Speier, and Worms
 Dietrich von Raittenau, Archbishop of Salzburg, 298
 Dillingen High School, 297
 „ Seminary, 298
 Dioceses in England (new), 337-8
 „ in Netherlands (defective organisation of), 376
 „ in Switzerland, 63-4
 „ in Russia, 413-14
 Dispensations (*see also* Marriage), 41, 201, 226
 Disputations, public, at Zürich, 67
 Dissidents (Poland), 409
 "Divorce" of Henry VIII., 328-30, 336
 Divorce, remarriage after, 223-6
 Döering at Erfurt, 8
 Dominicans and Galileo, 450
 „ and Jesuits, 199, 391
 „ in Paris, 394
 „ and Inquisition, 169
 „ Missions, 424, 426
 „ and theologians and Justification, 134
 Dominis, de (Bishop of Spalatro), 443
 Donato, Leonardo, 437, 442
 Donauwörth, 306-7
 Dort, Synod of (Dordrecht), 370, 385
 Douai, College at, 368
 Du Bellay, Guillaume, 96
 Duns Scotus on Justification, 465-6
 Durand, 268
 Dutch, immigration of, into Germany, 294
 Easter Communion, 157
 Eastern Church, 398
 „ „ and Calvinism, 416-17
 „ „ and Papacy, 411-12, 413, 414, 417
 „ „ and Lutherans, 398, 414-15, 416-17
 „ „ in Poland (and Roman Church), 403, 410
 Ecclesiastical Courts, 201, 244

- Ecclesiastical Courts in England, 321
Ecclesiæ de Unitate (Pole), 341-2
 Eck, John Maier, 34, 45, 80, 109, 283, 448
 „ Leonard von (Bavaria), 45
 Education, religious, in England, 326, 338, 349
 Edward VI., 348-9
 „ rebellion under, 349, 353
 „ death of, 354
 „ some of his laws repealed, 354
 Egidius of Viterbo, 18
 Eichsfeld, expulsion of Protestants from, 295-6
 Election of bishops. *See* Trent
 Eliassen, Paul, 91
 Elizabeth (England), 294, 358
 „ and Spain, 358
 „ her religious policy, 358-60
 „ and Council of Trent, 173, 215, 358
 „ Prayer Book of, 361
 „ Advertisements of, 361
 „ and Papacy, 367
 „ and Ireland, 371
 Elsass affected by Edict of Restitution, 311, 316
 Ely Registers, 1388-1426, 29
 Empire, Holy Roman, 2, 3
 England, Church of, 320
 Canon Law in, 321
 Ecclesiastical Courts, 321
 Its condition before the Reformation, 323
 And Parliament, 333-4
 Secular clergy, 325-6
 Monastic Orders, 324-5
 New Learning in, 327-8
 Its catholicity, 330
 Papal powers in, 320-3, 333-5, 339
 Synods in, 324, 334
 Fees, 324, 334
 Primate of, 339
 Reform in, 334
 Convocation, 333-4
 Visitations in, 324, 334
 England, Church of:
 Appeal to Pope, 335
 New sees (*see* Bishops), 338
 Doctrine of, 342-5
 Under Edward VI., 350-2, 354
 Under Mary, 357
 Projected reforms (1535), 357
 Plunder of, under Elizabeth and continued by James I., 359
 And Presbyterianism, 363
 Under Laud, 369-70
 Under Elizabeth and James I., 368-70
 Reform of, compared with that of Trent, 370
 In Civil War, 373
 After Restoration, 374
 General position, 374-5
 England, Roman Catholics in, 393
 „ before the Reformation, 5
 „ and Reformation, 320-75
 Episcopal organisations:
 In England, 361, 369
 In Scotland, 366
 In Netherlands, 376
 New scheme suggested for, 376
 In Switzerland, 63-4
 Episcopate and Lutheranism, 48, 57
 „ improvement of, in Germany, 297, 298
 „ weakness of, a cause of Protestantism, 298
Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum, 25
 Erasmus, 6, 12, 25 *seq.*, 51-3
 „ and Adrian VI., 39
 „ in Index, 183
 „ and Laski, 405
 „ „ Luther, 53
 „ „ Sorbonne, 94, 95
 „ „ Zwingli, 52, 66
 Erastus, 383
 Erastianism, 383-5
 Eric XIV. (Sweden), 399
 Eric Valkendorf, 85
 Ermland, South, Protestant, 401
 Ermland, Bishop of. *See* Hosius
 Ernest of Bavaria (Bishop of Freising), 294
 Estates (in France) and Jesuit theories, 395

- Estius, 448
 Etaples, d'. *See* Stapulensis
 Etienne, Robert, 389
 " Henry, 389
 Eucharist. *See* Trent and Mass
 Eucharist, the Holy (England), 351
 Excommunication, restriction of,
 244
 " in Poland, 407
 " power of, 244,
 382-3
 " of Venice, 444
 Exemptions, 19, 242
Exercitatorium Spirituale (of Cis-
 neros), 274
 Expectatives. *See* Trent
- Faber, Johann, Vicar-General of
 Constanz, Bishop of Vienna,
 52, 72, 80
 Fachinetto (Innocent IX.), 439
 Faenza, 281
 Faith, Rule of. *See* Trent
 Farel, Guillaume, 95, 96
 Farnese, Alexander. *See* Paul III.
 " " Cardinal, Legate
 in Germany, 127
 " " Pier Luigi, 116
 " " (the Farnesi), 153
 Fasting, maintenance of, 248
 " at Zürich, 74
 Federalism in Switzerland, 380
 Fees, ecclesiastical (England),
 324, 334
 Feodor (Russia), 413
 Ferdinand I. (Emperor), 54, 56,
 81, 167, 203-4, 213, 256, 299
 King of Bohemia and Hungary,
 56
 And Peace of Augsburg, 119
 His policy (and Paul IV.), 287
 And the Council of Trent, 193,
 199
 And Reformation of Princes,
 232
 And Libel of Reformation, 204
seq.
 Consults theologians for media-
 tion, 302
 Ferdinand and Isabella, 13
- Ferdinand of Styria, 304, 307
 In Bohemia and Hungary, 308
 As Emperor Ferdinand II., 308,
 312
 Forbids bloodshed, 299
 Ferdinand III., Emperor, 311, 316
 Ferrara gained by Pope, 429
 " and Venice, 442
 Ferreri, 253
 Ferrier, du, Ambassador at Trent,
 190, 216, 235
 Fèvre, Pierre le, 275, 283
 Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (1504-
 35), 335-6
 Flacius Illyricus, 289
 Florence, Council of, 410
 " " and Russia, 412
 Florida, Missions in, 421
 Foreign Churches in England, 353
 " theologians on Prayer
 Book, 361
 Foscarari, Bishop of Modena, 254,
 257
 Fox, Bishop of Winchester, 338
 France, 4
 " religion in, 101, 102, 387-8
 " policy towards Reforma-
 tion, 101
 " religious wars, 101-6
 " " " state after,
 387-8
 " " " learning in,
 387-9
 " and the Council (1559),
 152, 171, 174, 190, 193,
 208
 " and Spain, rivalry of, at
 Council, 101, 103, 105,
 222, 437, 446-7. *See also*
 Conclaves
 " Libel of Reformation, 205
 " influence on Council of
 Trent, 153
 " and Reformation of Prin-
 ces, 232
 " and Decrees of Trent, 251-2
 " and Germany, 82, 161
 " Thirty Years War, 314, 316
 France, Kings of:
 Francis I., 20, 32, 53, 103

- France, Kings of:
 Henry II., 103, 152
 Charles IX., 103, 188
 Henry III., 104, 409
 France. *See* Jesuits in France
 „ and Missions, 421, 427-8
 „ New, 427
 French Ambassadors withdrawn
 from Council, 232
 „ Bishops cited to Rome,
 214, 235
 Francis de Sales, S., 269, 272
 Franciscans, 8, 9, 264-5
 „ and Missions, 424, 426
 (See also Capuchins and
 Récollets.)
 Franconia affected by Edict of
 Restitution, 311
 Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 292
 „ „ „ troubles at,
 360-1
 Frauenalb, 305
 Frederick the Wise, Elector of
 Saxony, 28, 32
 „ III. of the Palatinate,
 290
 „ V. (Elector Palatine),
 King of Bohemia, 309
 Freising, 294
 Friesland, 56, 83
 Formula of Concord, 289, 292
 Freewill (*see* Augustinianism), 53
 Friars, the, 7
 „ Augustinian, 8
 Fuggers, the, 298
 „ (also involved with Leo
 X. and See of Mainz),
 31
 Funck, 291
 Fünfkirchen, Bishop of, 213
 Fureiro, 257-8
 Galicia, 403
 Galileo, his treatment, 449-52
 Gallen, S., 60
 Gallican Church, 94, 105, 172,
 251
 „ „ and Liberties, 20,
 235, 395-6
 „ „ and Sarpi, 444
 Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Win-
 chester, 336, 349-50, 356
 His *de Vera Obedientia*, 341-2
 Gaudix, Bishop of, 210
 Gebhard Truchsess (Archbishop
 of Köln), 294
 Geneva, 98
 „ Reformation at, 98-9, 363
 „ S. Francis de Sales at, 272
 Genoa, 441
 George von Khuenberg, Arch-
 bishop of Salzburg, 298
 George of Saxony, 54, 58
 George, Duke of Saxony, 19
 Germany before Reformation, 3, 23
 „ after Reformation
 (1521), 42-3
 „ Renaissance in, 10, 51,
 245
 „ and Decrees of Trent,
 251
 „ interests mainly re-
 ligious, 286
 „ and France (*see* Thirty
 Years War), 82, 161
 „ mediating party in,
 287-8
 „ politics tend to war,
 287-8
 „ religious geography of,
 56, 113, 116, 121,
 291, 292
 „ Bishops in South, 45
 „ Counter-Reformation in,
 294-306
 (See chapters iii., iv., vi., xi.)
 Gerson, 8
 Ghent, 380
 Ghislieri (*see* Pius V.), 433
 Giberti, 107, 109, 266
 Giustiniani, Paul, 264
 Glareanus (Lörizi), 53
 Gloucester, See of, 338
 Gnesio-Lutherans, 118
 Goa, Bishopric of, 424
 Gomar, 382-3
 Goniondzki, 408
 Gonzaga, Cardinal (Bishop of
 Mantua), Legate at Trent, 174,
 181, 199, 212, 217

- Goslar, 113
 Gotha, League of, 54
 Gothius, Archbishop, 400
 Granada, Guarrero, Archbishop,
 181, 182, 191, 193, 200, 217
 Granvelle, Cardinal, Bishop of
 Arras, 126, 378-9
 Grätz, 302, 303
 Greek College at Rome, 423
 Greenland, 86
 Gregory XIII. (*see* Popes), 298,
 301, 312
 Grocyn, 12
 Gröningen, 50
 Groot, Gerhard (*see* Brethren of
 Common Life), 11
 Gropper, 109, 110, 288, 468
 „ on synods, 159
 Grotius, Hugo, 381, 384
 Grumbach feud, 291
 Guise, Duke of, 103-4, 214
 „ Cardinal of (*see* Lorraine,
 Cardinal of), 104
 „ Charles of. *See* Lorraine,
 Cardinal of
 Guistiniani on Germany, 114
 Gustavus Adolphus, 313-14
 Gustavus Ericson (elected King
 of Sweden), 86-7

 Habsburgs, 286, 310, 317-18, 446
 „ marriages of, 56
 „ and Switzerland, 63,
 70, 78
 „ (*See* Charles V., Fer-
 dinand I., II., III., Matthias,
 Maximilian, Rudolf, Philip II.
 and III.)
 Halberstadt, See of, 293, 315, 316
 Hall, Bishop, 396
 Hamar, Bishop of, 85, 92
 Hamilton, Patrick, 348
 Havelberg, Bishopric of, 292-3
 Heidelberg, 383
 „ Catechism of, 290
 Heilbronn, 60
 „ League of, 314
 Held, von (Imperial Chancellor),
 112
 Holding and Interim, 116

 Helena, Queen of Abyssinia, 422
 Henry of Anjou in Poland, 409
 „ III. (France), 392
 „ IV. (France) of Navarre,
 104-5, 306, 388, 389,
 393, 394
 „ „ (France) of Navarre
 and Sixtus V., 437-8
 „ „ (France) of Navarre
 and Clement VIII.,
 440-1
 Henry VIII. of England, 320
 New Learning under, 327-8
 His divorce, 328-30, 336
 Religious policy of, 331, 336,
 345
 And the Church, 333-7
 His legislation, 338
 Position of, 341-7
 And Scotland, 347
 And Ireland, 371
 Review of reign, 345-7
 Destruction of shrines, 346
 Henry of Saxe-Lauenburg (Arch-
 bishop of Bremen), 293
 Hermann von Wied (Bishop of
 Köln), 114, 116
 His *Consultation*, 352
 Herzogenbusch, 25
 Hesse, 56, 83, 121, 292
 „ Landgrave, Philip of, 54,
 60, 70, 78, 113, 115-16, 119,
 289
 Hildesheim only Catholic See in
 North Germany, 1557-73, 293,
 294
 Hierarchy, Roman, in Ireland (*see*
 Bishops, Trent), 372
 Hirschorn, 305
 Hispaniola (San Domingo), 426
 Hochstraten, 24, 32
 Hoen, Cornelius van, 75, 377
 Holstein (*see* Schleswig), 121, 292
 Holy Orders. *See* Trent
 Homilies, First Book of, 350
 Hooker, 362, 369
 Hooper and his objection to vest-
 ments, 353
 Hosius, Cardinal, Legate at Trent,
 174, 194, 196, 199, 212

- Hosius, Cardinal, in Poland, 406, 409
- Hugo von Landenburg (Bishop of Constanz), 72
- Huguenotism, origin of, 95, 96-7
- ,, history of, 214
- ,, organisation of, 102
- ,, toleration of, 103
- ,, in colonies, 421, 427
- ,, separation of, 388
- (See Religious Wars, France, and Edict of Nantes.)
- Hulst, Francis van der, 378
- Humanism, 24, 51-2
- ,, Roman, 9
- ,, German, 24 on
- ,, Polish, 403
- ,, and Zwingli, 67
- ,, later, 52, 268, 448
- ,, and the Breviary, 252-3
- Hungary, 56
- ,, Reformation in, 299, 306, 310-14
- ,, Counter-Reformation in, 305
- ,, Ferdinand of Styria in, 308-9
- ,, Lutherans in, and *Formula of Concord*, 292
- Hussite influence, 73
- ,, in Poland, 403
- ,, views, 34, 36, 49
- Hurons, the, 428
- Hutten, Ulrich von, 24-5, 36, 52
- Ignatius, S. See Loyola
- Images, 240, 346
- Immaculate Conception :
- Disputed between Franciscans and Dominicans, 136
- Referred to at Trent, 133
- Immunities of Church (see also Reformation of Princes), 245
- Immunities, Clerical, 232-4
- ,, at Venice, 442
- ,, Congregation on, 439, 446
- Imperial Cities in Germany, 54, 60, 78, 80
- Imperial Chamber. See Reichskammergericht
- Independents (see Congregationalists), 373
- Index, 182-5
- ,, and Copernicus, 449
- ,, and Galileo, 449-52
- ,, left to Pope after Trent, 248
- ,, by the Sorbonne, 97
- ,, discussion at Trent, 175, 181
- Individualism, growth of, 6
- Indulgences, Luther, 29 seq., 33 seq.
- ,, Leo X. on, 29-33
- ,, Adrian VI. on, 41
- ,, Zwingli, 68
- ,, restricted, 195-6
- ,, Decree upon, 239, 246-8
- Indults, Germany, 293-4
- Infallibility, 32
- ,, and Galileo's case, 451
- (See Papacy generally.)
- Ingolstadt, 34, 283
- Injunctions, the (1547), 350
- Institution of a Christian man* (1537), 343
- Innsbruck, 161
- Inquisition, 13, 234
- ,, and Caraffa, 169
- ,, in Netherlands, 378-9
- ,, in Spain, 386
- ,, Spanish, at Trent, 234-5
- ,, Congregations of, 434
- ,, and Galileo, 449
- ,, and Carranza, 236-7
- ,, suggested in Italy, 234-5
- ,, suggested in Poland, 405
- Institutes (or Institutio) of Calvin, 97-8
- At Oxford, 368-9
- Interim of Augsburg (1548), 116
- Refused in Sweden, 400
- Causes immigration into England, 348
- Interim of Leipzig, 116
- Ireland, Reformation in, 371-2
- Iroquois, the, 428

Isabella and Ferdinand, 13
 „ sister to Charles V., 86
 Isn'y, 60
 Isodore of Moscow, at Florence,
 412
 Italy, 3
 „ religious thought in, 107
 „ Socinians from, 408
 „ Italian Bishops at Trent,
 141, 149, 250
 Ivan III., Russia, 412
 „ IV. (the Terrible), 412-13
 Jagellon, Catharine, 399-400, 410
 James I., England, 309, 369-70,
 393
 „ „ and Scotland, 364
 Jansen, 135-6
 Jay, Le (Jesuit), 283
 Jeanne of Navarre, heresy of, 235
 Jeremiah of Constantinople, 414
 „ II. of Constantinople,
 415
 Jerome, S., College of, at Dillin-
 gen, 297-8
 Jerusalem, Synod of (1672), 415
 Jesuits :—
 Beginnings and history, 27, 272
seq., 389-97
 At Venice, 275
 Objects of, 276, 390, 397
 Peculiarities and organisation
 of, 277, 278, 280, 281, 397
 Generals of, 277, 280-1, 390-1,
 397
 Training of, 279
 Grades of, 280
 Changes among, 396-7
 And Popes, 277-8
 „ „ Paul III., 275
 „ „ Julius III., 277
 „ „ Marcellus II., 277
 „ „ Paul IV., 275, 277
 „ „ Pius IV., 278
 „ „ Sixtus V., 436
 Later history of, 389-96
 In Austrian lands (Styria, etc.),
 303, 305, 311
 In Bavaria, 283, 303
 In England, 284-5

Jesuits :—
 In France, 105, 282, 393-6
 „ opposition to, from
 Sorbonne, 282, 394
 „ and Parliament of
 Paris, 282, 393-5
 In Italy, 281
 In Germany, 283-4, 296-9, 301
seq.
 In Poland, 406-10
 In Sweden, 401-2
 In Scandinavia, 400-2, 406, 409
 In Spain, 281-2, 390-1
 In Switzerland, 72, 269
 In the East, 417
 And Dominicans, 281, 391
 Charles V., 281
 Colleges of, 281-4
 Their great scholars, 448
 Classics, 448
 Controversies, 134-7, 381-6
 Augustinianism, 134-7, 390-1
 Justification, 133-4, 468
 Political theories, 392-5
 Casuistry of, 396
Ratio Studiorum 390-1, 397
 Freedom of exegesis, 194
 Peace of Prague, 315
 And Protestantism, 273
 Sarpi and Venice, 444-5
 Science (Kepler and Galileo),
 449
 Council of Trent, 175 *seq.*
 Missions, 422, 424-8
 Jesus, Name of, 271
 Joachim, Frederick (Branden-
 burg), as Bishop, 293,
 295
 „ Sigismund (Branden-
 burg), 291
 John (Saxony), 54, 60
 „ of God (Seville), 270
 „ Sulakas, 422
 „ III. (Sweden), 399-401, 402
 „ William of Cleve, succes-
 sion to, 305
 „ Casimir (of Palatinate), 291,
 294
 „ Frederick, Duke of Saxony,
 115, 289

- John (Saxony), 312
 „ George (Brandenburg),
 Bishop of Strassburg, 306
 Joigny, Count de, 271
 Joseph II. of Constantinople, 414
 Julius, Bishop of Würzburg, 296
 “Justice” of God, Luther’s view
 of, 466–7
 Justification by Faith, 48, 79, 80,
 108, 110
 History of doctrine, 132
 Luther, 80, 130, 132, 465–9
 Jesuits, 110, 134, 468
 Medieval views, 464–8
 Moderate Catholic views, 110
 Note on, 464–8
 Reformers’ views, 464–8
 Tridentine doctrine of, 133,
 467–8
 German Augustinians, 133
 Anglican doctrine, 342–4, 467–8
 Later controversies upon (Mo-
 lina, Jansen, Bajus), 135,
 390–1

 Kadan Treaty, 83
 Kammergericht (Reichs) or Im-
 perial Court, 84, 110, 304, 305
 Kappel, Peace of (first), 69–71
 „ „ (second), 71–2
 Katherine of Aragon, 329–30, 336
 Kempten, 60
 Ken, Bishop, 374
 Kennebec, 427
 Kepler, 449
 Kettler, Gotthard, 411
 Kiev, See of, 403
 King’s Book (Necessary Doctrine,
 etc.), 344
 Klesl, Cardinal, and Bishop of
 Vienna, 304
 Klostergrab incident before Thirty
 Years War, 307–8
 Knights of the Sword (Livonia),
 411
 Knox, 348, 354
 Köln, 291, 294
 „ Hermann of Wied (*see*
 Hermann), 114
 „ Nunciature at, 301

 Köln, Reuchlin’s case, 24
 „ University of, makes an
 Index, 183

 Labrador, 427
 Ladislav (Czar), 415
 Lainez at Trent, 134, 161, 175,
 199, 202, 208, 212, 275,
 277, 278, 283, 392
 „ at Poissy, 102–3
 Lanciano, Archbishop of, 192, 254
 Lansac, de, at Trent, 188–9, 190
 Lapide, Cornelius a, 448
 Lasco. *See* Laski.
 Laski, John (a Lasco), 404–5, 407
 Last Supper, our Saviour’s sacri-
 fice at, 199–200
 Lateran Council, 17 on
 Laud, Archbishop, 369
 „ his character and aims, 370
 „ reforms by, 371
 „ and Civil War, 372–3
 „ and Arminianism, 385
 „ compared with Nikon, 420
 Laureo (Nuncio in Poland), 409
 Lazare, Priory of S., 271
 League, the Holy, 16
 In France, 103–5
 Catholic (1609), Germany, 307,
 309–13
 (*See* Cambrai, Religious wars in
 France.)
 Learning and the Church, 448
 Lebus, See of, 292
 Legate (*Legatus Natus*), 339
 Legislation, anti-papal:—
 In England, 321, 334–6
 In Venice, 442
 Leipzig disputation (1519), 34
 „ Interim, 116
 Leo X. *See* Popes
 Leopold, Archduke, Bishop of
 Halberstadt, 311, 315
 Lepanto, battle of (1571), 430
 Letter of Majesty in Bohemia, 307
 Lewis XII. (France), 17
 „ XIII. „ 388, 395
 „ XIV. „ 105
 Libel of Reformation, 175, 190, 193
 „ „ German, 204–5

- Libel of Reformation, French, 205-6
- Liberty of Worship:
 For Lutherans, Germany, 315
 For Calvinists (*see* Calvinists), 317
 In Poland, 407
 (*See* Toleration.)
- Liège (diocese), 376
- Lindau, 60-80
- Lippomani, Bishop of Verona, 151, 409
- Lipsius, 381
- Lismanini, 404
- Litany in English, 345, 350
- Lithuania, 403, 411
 „ under See of Kiev, 403
- Liturgy, revision of Russian, 413, 419
 „ Books of, in East, 419
 (*See* Missal, Breviary, Prayer Book.)
- Livonia (secularised), 411
- Loaysa and slavery, 426
- Loci Communes* of Melancthon, 48
- Lollards, etc., in Netherlands, 377
 „ in England, 325
- Lombard, Peter, 448
 „ „ on Justification, 465
- Loretti, 428
- Lörity (Glareanus), 53
- Lorraine, Cardinal of, Charles of Guise (1574), 205, 206, 209-14, 216, 218, 222, 235, 237, 238, 249, 282
- Lorraine, Cardinal of (Bishop of Metz and Elect Bishop of Strassburg), 306
- Louvain theology, 27, 135
 „ Jesuit College at, 282
 „ theologians and Elizabeth of England, 359
 „ University and Index, 182
 „ University and Vulgate, 259
- Loyola (S. Ignatius de Recalde), 6, 386, 435
- Loyola, his training and life, 273-5
 „ compared with Lainez, 278
- Lucar, Cyril, 412, 416-17
 „ „ compared to Cranmer, 416
 „ his Confession, 417
- Lübeck, 83
 „ See of, 293
- Ludovisi (*see* Gregory XV.), 446
 „ Cardinal Ludovico, 446
- Luna, de (Spanish ambassador at Trent), 222, 232, 249
- Lüneburg (Brunswick), 56, 60, 82
- Luther, 6, 27-38
 Called to Rome, 32
 Three great writings (1520), 36
 Papal Bull against, 36
 Edict of Worms, 37-8
 And Adrian VI., 40
 At the Wartburg, 42
 Doctrines of, 46-7
 Translation of Bible, 46
 And Wiclif, 47
 And the Peasants, 50-2
 And the Anabaptists, 52-3
 And Erasmus, 53
 And Zwingli, 59, 64, 65, 77
 And Justification, 80, 130-4, 465-9
 Great popular writings of, 36
Against the Papacy founded by the Devil at Rome, 115
 Errors upon Justification, 130, 466-8
 Errors upon Justification, Denifle on, 466-7
 Death of, 117
 On Copernicus, 449
- Lutheranism, 46-7, 79
 And Zwinglianism, 59, 77-80, 109
 Divisions among, 117-18
 Spread of, 56, 83, 84, 112-14
 At its height, 1555, 121
 Organisation in Germany, 56-7
 And Catholics (dividing line between), 288
 In England and Scotland, 336, 345, 348
 In Poland, 404, 407

Lutheranism :

- In Sweden, 399-401
- And Eastern Church, 398, 414, 416-17
- Effect of controversy on, 297
- And classics, 297
- Later history and conflict with Calvinists, 110 *seq.*, 289-92, 317
- And Council, 140, 160-1, 165, 171, 181-2, 262
- Lützen, battle of, 314
- Luzern, 72
- Mabillon, 268
- Madruzzo, Cardinal, Bishop of Trent, 141, 211
- Magdeburg, 54, 83, 292
 - „ See of, 293, 316
 - „ and Interim, 118
- Magnusson, John, Archbishop of Upsale, 87
- Mainz, See of, 295
- Major Orders, 219
- Malaspina, 401
- Maldonatus, 448
- Manresa, 274
- Mantua, Council at, postponed, 126, 336
- Mar Shimun, 422
- Marcellus II. (Cervini), 168
- Margaret of Angoulême, 96, 103
- Marian persecution, responsibility for, 357
 - „ exiles, return of, 360-1
 - „ bishops, 367
 - „ bishops in Ireland, 371-2
- Mariana, 391-3
- Marini, 254, 257
- Maronites, College for, Rome, 422
- Marriage dispensations, 41, 226
 - „ low standard at Reformation, 223
 - „ clandestine, 224
 - „ clerical, 351
 - „ „ in England, 356
 - „ „ in Poland, 406-7
- (See Trent (Topics) and Libel of Reformation.)

- Martène, 268
- Martyr, Peter, at Poissy, 102
- Mary, England (accession), 354
 - „ and Charles V., 355
 - „ her marriage, 355
 - „ change in religious policy, 356
 - „ Persecution under, 357
 - „ her death, 357
 - „ sister to Charles V., 56
 - „ of Scots, 364-5, 367
- Marx (Sittich), Archbishop of Salzburg, 298
- Mass, 155-7, 196-9, 344, 351
 - „ and Lutherans, 57
 - „ and Calvin, 100
 - „ and Zwinglians, 57, 61, 67, 70, 75, 79
 - „ in vernacular, 57, 204-5, 351, 409
- Masses, regulation of, numbers restricted, etc., 193-200
 - „ singing during, 117
 - (See Palestrina, Trent, Holy Communion.)
- Matthias, 306-8
- Maur, Congregation of S., 268
- Maurice of Saxony (Albertine), 115-17, 119, 165
 - „ of Nassau, 384
- Maximilian I., Emperor, 18
- Maximilian II., Emperor, 167, 215, 293, 299, 409
 - And Philip II., 300
 - Religious policy of, 300, 302
 - Attempts a religious compromise, 302
- Maximilian of Bavaria (1597-1651), 305-6
 - Elector (1523), 306-12
- Mazzolini Silvester. See Prieras
- Mecheln (Mechlin), 378
- Mecklenburg, 121, 292, 316
- “Mediating” theologians (see Cassander, Contarini, Erasmus, Gropper, Pflug, Pole, Regensburg colloquy, Seripando), 110-11, 467-8
- Medici, Giovanni de. See Leo X.

- Medici, Giulio de. *See* Clement VII.
 ,, Gianangelo de. *See* Pius IV.
 Medieval thought, 1, 5-6, 176-80, 230
 Church and State, 230 *seq.*, 392
 Medina, de, 396
 Meissen, Bishopric of, 293
 Melanchthon, 42, 48, 78, 79, 96, 109, 114, 152, 290, 407-8
 ,, and Intermin, 117
 ,, controversies, 119, 289
 ,, and Eastern Church, 414
 ,, his death, 290
 Melchior, Cano, 236, 385
 Meletius Striga, 418
 Memmengen, 60, 80
 Mendez, 422
 Mendoza, 126
 Menendez, 421
 Mercurianus, 390
 Merici, Angela di, 266
 Merit, doctrine of human, 390, 466
 Merseburg, Bishopric of, 293
 Messina, 281
 Michael Romanof, 416
 Middle Ages, institutions and ideals of, 1
 Milan, capture of, 38
 "Millenary" Petition, 369
 Miltitz, 33
 Milton, debased view of Incarnation, 465
 Minden, *See* of, 293, 316
 Miracles, 240
Mirror of the Christian, 8
Missæ Siccæ, 198
 Missal, revision of, 256
 ,, and Pius V., 433
 Missions, 421-8
 ,, parochial, 270
 ,, problems of, 424-7
 ,, Society of, 271
 ,, in East Indies, Travancore, Japan, China, and Malabar, 424-5
 Missions in Mexico, Brazil, 425-6
 ,, in Paraguay, West Indies, 426
 ,, in Canada. *See* Jesuits
 Modena, 108
 Mogilas, 418
 ,, Confession of, 418
 ,, Catechism of, 418-19
 Mohacs, battle of (1526), 56
 Molina, 135, 390
 Monasteries, condition of, generally, 241
 Condition of, England, 324-5
 Reform of, 241
 Dissolution of, England, 337-8
 Monastic revivals, 8-9, 264, 269
 Benedictines, Camoldolites, Barnabites, 8-9, 264-5, 269
 Among Friars, Franciscans, Capuchins, 8-9, 265
 Monophysitism, 423
 Montalto, Cardinal of (younger), 439. *See* also Sixtus V.
 Monte, Del, Cardinal (Legate at Trent) (*see* also Julius III.), 127
 Montreal, 427
 Monts, de, 427
 Montserrat, 274
 Moravia (*see* also Austrian lands), 310
 More, Sir Thomas, 3, 12, 25
 On Papal and Royal Supremacy, 322, 344-5, 327-8, 330
 Morone, 108, 109, 126, 246, 250
 ,, in Germany as Nuncio (1540-1), 109
 ,, and Peace of Augsburg, 121
 ,, Legate at Trent, 212-14, 216
 Morosini, the Ridolto, 443
 Morton, Archbishop, 325
 Mortuaries (England), 332
 Moscow, Metropolitan and *See* of, 403, 412-14, 416, 420
 ,, made a Patriarchate, 413
 ,, Job (first Patriarch), 414
 ,, Synod of (1551), 413
 Moslemism, 430-1
 Mosul, 422

- Mühlberg, battle of, 115
 Mühlhausen, 50
 Münster, Anabaptists at, 74, 84
 „ See of, 296
 Munich, 383
 „ Nunciature at, 301
 Münzer, 49, 72
 Muretus on Pius V., 433
 Music in churches, 193
 „ Commission on (Palestrina),
 256-7
 Mysticism in Germany, 10
- Nacchiante (Bishop of Chioggia),
 142
 Nantes, Edict of, 106, 388
 Naples, 441
 Nassau, 292
 Natives and missionaries, 424-7
 Naumburg, See of, 293
 „ colloquy at, 290
 Navagero, Cardinal, Legate at
 Trent, 212-13
 Navarre. See Henry of, Jeanne of
Necessary Doctrine and Erudition
 (1543), 344
 Nepotism, papal, 3-4, 168, 173
 Neri, S. Philip, 267, 435
 Nestorians (Persia), 422, 424
 Netherlands, 376-85
 „ episcopal organisa-
 tion in, 376
 „ Charles V. in, 376,
 378
 „ Philip II. in, 376-80
 „ medieval heresies in,
 377
 „ Anabaptists in, 377
 „ Augustinians in, 377
 „ Inquisition in, 378,
 379
 „ Revolt of, 378-81
 „ Decrees of Trent in,
 379
 „ “the Compromise,”
 379
 „ division of, 380-1
 „ learning in, 381
 „ theological struggles
 in, 383-5
- Netherlands, effect upon Europe
 of revolt in, 385
 New World, missions in, 421,
 424-8
 Nicæa (Meletius Striga), 418
 Nicholas of Cusa. See Cusa
 Nidaros. See Trondhjem
 Nikon, Patriarch, 419-20
 Nîmes, Edict of, 388
 Nobili, 424
 Nominalism, 176, 396
 „ and human merit,
 465, 468
 Nordlingen, 60
 „ battle of, 315
 Norway, 85, 86
 „ Lutheranism in, 92
 Nova Scotia (Acadia), 427
 Novgorod, 420
 Number signing Decrees at Trent,
 249-50
 Nunciatures, permanent, 434
 „ in Germany, 301
 „ at Luzern, 269
 „ in Switzerland, 72
 „ effect of, 191
 „ in Poland, 409
- Nürnberg, 60, 292
 „ Diet of 1522, 42
 „ „ 1524, 44
 „ Bond (1538), 112
 „ Religious peace of, 81
 „ illustrates condition of
 worship, 118
- Obedientia, de Vera* (Gardiner),
 341-2
 „ „ *præstanda*
 (Sampson), 341
- Oblates, the, 268
 Observants and Conventuals (see
 Franciscans), 8, 265
 Œcolompadius, 97
 Ochini, Bernardino, 265
 Offices (Hours) popular in Eng-
 land, 327
 Oldenbarnveld, 384
 Olivarez, 438
 Opitz, 304
 Oratory (S. Philip de Neri), 267

- Oratory of Divine Love, 9, 107, 266
 „ of Jesus (Cardinal Bérulle), 267
- Orders. *See Ordination* under
 Trent
 „ Holy, 195
 „ Minor, 217-20
 „ Monastic (*see* Benedictines, Monasteries, and Excommunication of Venice), 444
- Original Sin. *See* Trent
- Orleans, Isle of, 428
- Ormia, 422
- Ortenburg, 304
- Orzechowski, 406-7
- Osnabrück, *See* of, 293, 316
 „ Treaty of (part of Treaty of Westphalia), 316
- Ottawa, River, 427
- Otto von Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg, 297
- Oviedo (Abyssinia), 422
- Oxenstiern, 314
- Oxford, *See* of, 338
- Paderborn, *See* of, 293, 296
- Pacheco, Cardinal, Bishop of Jaën, 142
- Pack, Otto von, 58
- Palatinate, 121, 292, 317
 „ the, becomes Lutheran, 114
 „ and Calvinism, 290
 „ Upper, Counter-Reformation in, 312
 „ in Thirty Years War, 309
- Paleotto, 186
- Palestrina, 256-7
- Pamfilii (Innocent X.), 447
- Pampeluna, 274
- Papacy :
 And Abyssinia, 421-3
 Elizabeth (England), 367
 England, 320-3, 333-5, 339, 355
 Germany, 35, 40, 54, 82
 Philip II. (Spain), 392
 Poland, 405
 Thirty Years War, 446-7
- Papacy :
 Treaty of Westphalia, 318
 And kings generally, 392
 Before Reformation, 2-5, 12, 21
 Council, 137, 174, 189
 And Council of Trent (VII., VIII., IX.), 262
 And Council of Trent, confirms Decrees, 250
 Its authority and bishops, 207-12
 Authority of, reserved, 245
 Questions left to, 237
 After Trent, 430 *seq.*, 452-3
 Centralised power, 237, 247
 Officials, 430-2
 Finances of, 430
 Taxation of Papal States, 429
 Secretaries, Papal, 432
 States under Gregory XIII., 434
 Popes on Justification, 135
 And missions (*see* Popes, Trent, Council of), 421-5
- Paris, Parliament of, and Lutheranism, 95
 „ Treaty of (1634), 316
 „ Parliament of, 393-4 (*See* University.)
- Parker, Matthew (Archbishop), 360-2, 449
- Parliament, English :
 The Reformation (1529), 332-4
 Edward VI., 350
 Mary, 355
 Elizabeth, 359-60
 In Civil War, 373
- Parliament of Paris. *See* Paris, Parliament of
- Parma, 38, 168
 „ Duke of, 295
 „ Margaret of, 282
 „ War of, 153
- Parthenius, 418
- Pascal, 396
- Passau, *See* of, 298, 302
 „ Treaty of (1552), 119
- Patavinus, 194
- Patriarchates, the Five, 413, 422
- Patristics, study of, 11, 25, 448

- Patronage. *See* Trent
 Paul III. *See* Popes
 „ „ IV. (Caraffa) (*see* Popes), 9,
 168
 „ „ earlier career, 168-9
 „ „ policy of, in Nether-
 lands, Poland, and
 England, 170-1
 „ „ anti-Spanish, 171
 „ „ and Index, 183
 Pavia, battle of (1525), 53
 Peasants, revolt of, 49
 Penance. *See* Trent
 Peretti (*see* Sixtus V.), 435
 Perron, du, 388-9, 394, 395
 Persecution, German and Spanish
 contrasted, 299
 Petavius, 448
 Peterborough, *See* of, 338
 Peterssens, the (Sweden), 87-8
 Pflug, Julius von (Bishop of
 Naumburg), 109, 116, 117, 288,
 468
 Pfyffer, Ludwig, 72
 Phauser, 299
 Philaret (Patriarch of Moscow),
 416
 Philip II. (Spain), 167, 168, 208,
 214, 282, 355
 „ And Carranza, 236-7
 „ colonies, 421
 „ Maximilian II., 300
 „ Netherlands, 376, 378, 386
 „ Papacy, 392
 „ Sweden, 400
 „ Reformation of Princes,
 232
 (*See* Papacy and Spain, and Trent,
 Council of.)
 Philip III. (Spain), 386, 426
 „ Metropolitan of Moscow, 413
 „ of Hesse. *See* Hesse, Philip of
 Philippists (Melanchthonists), 291
 Piacenza, 38
 Piarists, 270
 Pibrac, de, at Trent, 190
 Pighino, Archbishop of Siponto,
 151
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 338
 Piotrikow, Diet of, 406
 Pirkheimer, 52
 Pisa, Council of (1511), 17, 18
 Pius III. (Piccolomini) (*see* Popes),
 15
 Pius IV. (*see* Popes), 172
 Placards in Netherlands, 378-9
 Plessis, Mornay du, 389
 Pluralities (*see* Trent), 229
 „ in England, 332-3
 Poissy, Colloquy of (1561), 102,
 210, 283
 Poggiano, 258
 Poland, 402-11
 „ religious divisions in, 403
 „ Greek Church in, 403
 „ and Lutheranism, 403, 407
 „ Hussites in, 403
 „ Renaissance in, 403
 „ and Calvinism, 404-5
 „ Reformation in, 405
 „ and Papacy, 405
 „ Jesuits in, 406, 409, 410
 „ liberty of worship in, 407
 „ religious equality in, 409
 „ religious experiment in,
 407-8
 „ Socinians in (expelled), 408
 „ Nationalism in, 408-9
 „ Uniat Church in, 410
 „ „ „ religious divi-
 sions, 411
 „ and Sweden, 399
 Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, Arch-
 bishop of Canterbury, 108,
 109, 126, 134, 150, 341-2,
 355, 356
 His *Reformatio Angliæ*, 357
 And Justification, 134
 Legate at Trent, 127
 Pomerania, 84, 91, 121, 292
 Popes:
 Martin V. (1417-31), 432
 Calixtus III. (1455-8), 432
 Pius II. (1458-64), 430
 Paul II. (1464-71), 432
 Sixtus IV. (Rovere) (1471-84), 3
 Innocent VIII. (Cibo) (1484-92),
 432
 Alexander VI. (Borgia) (1492-
 1503), 3, 15, 425

Popes :

Pius III. (Piccolomini) (1503), 15

Julius II. (Rovere) (1503-13),
12, 15-17, 25, 30Leo X. (Medici) (1513-21), 12,
19, 33, 37, 38, 183,, and Breviary, 253, 265,
323, 432Adrian VI. (van Trusen) (1552-
3), 13, 39, 40, 42, 44, 83Clement VII. (Medici) (1523-
34), 44, 53, 55,
82-3, 107,, and Breviary,
253, 323Paul III. (Farnese) (1534-49),
107, 124-5, 118,
336

,, and Breviary, 254

,, and Henry VIII.,
345

,, and Jesuits, 275

Julius III. (del Monte) (1550-5),
118, 150, 168, 277, 355Marcellus II. (Cervini) (1555),
168, 277Paul IV. (Caraffa) (1555-9), 9,
107-9, 168-72, 183,, and Breviary, 254,
277, 357Pius IV. (Medici) (1559-65),
172-3, 208-12,
232, 238, 250, 256

,, and Breviary, 254

,, and Catechism, 257

,, and Vulgate, 259

,, and Creed, 261, 433

Pius V. (Ghislieri) (1566-72),
293, 300, 430, 431, 433-6Gregory XIII. (Buoncompagni)
(1572-85), 390,
430, 434-6, 439,, and Sweden, 400,
423,, and Congrega-
tions, 434,, and Nuncia-
tures, 434,, and Calendar,
435Sixtus V. (Peretti) (1585-90),
250, 255,, and Vulgate, 259, 430,
435-8

,, his early life, 436

,, his schemes, 436

,, his policy, 437

,, and France, 437-8

Urban VII. (Castagna) (1590),
439Gregory XIV. (Sfondrati)
(1590-1), 259, 430-1, 439Innocent IX. (Fachinetti)
(1591), 439-40Clement VIII. (Aldobrandini)
(1592-1605), 255-6,
260, 391, 401, 410,
429, 440-1

,, and Vulgate, 440

,, and Breviary, 440

Leo XI. (Medici) (1605), 441

Paul V. (Borghese) (1605-21),
393, 423, 429, 441

,, and Venice, 441-5

Gregory XV. (Ludovisi) (1621-
3), 422-3, 425, 445-6Urban VIII. (Barberini) (1623-
44), 255-6, 423,
429, 446-7, 449,, policy in Thirty
Years War, 446Innocent X. (Pamfilii) (1644-
55), 431, 447-8

Clement XI. (1700-21), 431

Port Royal, 427

Portugal and Abyssinian Missions,
422

,, and Missions, 424

Possevin (Jesuit), 269, 400, 410,
412*Potestate, de ecclesiastica et politica*
(Richer), 394

Pouy, 270

Præmunire, 320, 333, 334

Pragmatic Sanction, 19, 20, 94

Prague, University of, 299

,, Jesuits at, 292

,, Counter-Reformation in,
312

,, Peace of (1635), 314, 315

- Prat, du, 282
 Prayer Book (English), 327, 345,
 347, 351, 353
 " " (1549), 351
 " " (1552), 353-4
 " " (1559), 361
 " " and Laud, 369
 " " after Restoration,
 373-4
 " " in Ireland, 372
 " " in Scotland, 364-5
 " " and John Knox
 (Black Rubric),
 354
 Preaching. *See* Trent
 Predestination (*see* Freewill, and
 Augustinianism), 289
 Presbyterian Organisation :
 At Geneva, 100, 382
 In France, 102, 363, 382
 In England, 361-4, 368, 373
 In Scotland, 393-6, 382
 In the Netherlands, 381-4
 Prierias (Mazzolini), 32
 Primacy of Rome (Canon of
 Trent), 211. *See* Papacy
 Primers (English), 345
 Princes, Protestant, in Germany
 (*see* Germany throughout),
 56, 59, 300-1
 In league with France, 161
 Neutral in Thirty Years War,
 309, 313
 Princes, Reformation of (Trent),
 230, 392
 Printing-press, 20
 Probabilism, 396
 Procedure, ecclesiastical. *See*
 Trent
Professio Fidei Catholicæ (Hosius),
 406
 Proles, Andreas, 8
 Protestation of Speier, 60
 Provisions (*see* Trent), 229, 320
 Provisors, 320, 333, 334
 Prussia, 56, 83, 291, 404
 Purgatory, Decree upon (Trent)
 (*see* Trent), 240, 247-8
 Puy, Cardinal du, Legate at
 Trent, 174
 Quebec, 427
 Questers (*see* also Indulgences),
 186, 195, 239, 247
 Quignon, Cardinal (Breviary),
 253, 351-2
 Racovian Catechism (Poland),
 408
 Radziwill, Barbara, 405
Ratio Studiorum (Jesuits), 390,
 396-7
Rationale, Anglican (Cranmer),
 351
 Ratisbon. *See* Regensburg
 Ratzeburg, *See* of, 293, 316
 Récollets (French Franciscans),
 427-8
 Red Book (in Sweden), 400
 Reforms, ecclesiastical, German
 demand for, 15, 18
 At Council of Lateran, 19
 At Worms, 38
 Proposed at Regensburg (1524),
 45
 In England begun by clergy,
 334
 Pflug's plan of (Catholic), 116
 (*See* Paul III., *Consilium dele-*
 torum, de emendanda
 ecclesia.)
 And doctrine, relative import-
 ance of. *See* Trent
 Forty-two Chapters on. *See*
 Trent
 Of Trent, effect of, 241-2
Reformatio Legum (England), 333
 Reformation, how far German, 62
 " and Papacy, 452-3
 " right of (Treaty of
 Westphalia), 317
 (*See* Libel of Reformation, also
 Counter-Reformation.)
 Reformed, the (*i.e.* Calvinists),
 101
 "Reformers before Reformation"
 (the phrase), 467
Rege, de, et Regis Institutione,
 392
 Regensburg (Ratisbon), 114
 " Conference of (1524), 57

- Regensburg, League of, 78
 „ Colloquy of, preparations for (1541), 109, 110, 126
 „ Second Colloquy of (1545), 115
 „ the Consistory and, 110
 „ how far agreement reached at, 110
 „ Diet of (1541), 109
 „ Recess of, 110
 „ Diet of (1576), 301
 Regulars, Reformation of. *See* Trent
 Reichskammergericht (Imperial Court), 84, 110, 304, 305
 Reinhard, Marten, 89
 Relics, 240
 Remonstrance (Netherlands), 384
 Reservation, the Ecclesiastical (*Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*), 286, 287, 294, 301, 317
 Reservations. *See* Trent
 Residence of bishops. *See* Trent
 „ clergy. *See* Trent
 Restitution, Edict of (1629), 311
 Retreats founded, 271
 Reuchlin, 24
 Reutlingen, 60
 Revival, religious, 7
 „ monastic (*see* chap. x.), 8
 Rhenanus, Beatus, 175
 Ricci, 424
 Richer, 394-5
 Richelieu, 314, 316, 395, 446
 Ridley, Bishop of London (his visitation), 353
 Ritschl on "Reformers before Reformation," 467
 Rocca, 259
 Roman Catholics in England, 367
 „ „ in Ireland, 372
 „ Jurisdiction in England, 320-31, 335, 336
 „ „ Bishop Gardiner on, 341-2
 Romanof, House of, 416
 Rome, sack of (1527), 55
 Rome, English College at, 368
 „ and Eastern Church, 413-15
 (See also Papacy, Popes.)
 Revere. *See* Julius II.
 Rubric, the Ornaments, 361
 „ the Black (on kneeling at Communion), 355
 Rudolf, Emperor, 300, 304-7.
 Russia, 411-20
 „ its Patriarchate, 413
 „ religious policy, 412, 413
 „ organisation of Church in, 413, 414, 418-19
 „ and Lutherans, 419
 „ national movement in, 415-16
 „ Romanof dynasty, 416
 „ Church and State in, 416-20
 „ Confessions of, 418
 „ Liturgic revision in, 413, 419-20
 „ at the time of Reformation, 420
 Sacraments. *See* Trent
 Sadoleti, 109, 126, 266
 Saints, Invocation of, 240, 343
 Salamanca, 274, 282
 Salentin von Isenburg (Archbishop of Köln), 294
 Salmeron, 175, 199, 207
 Saltpetrière, 271
 Salvation, Augsburg Confession on, 79
 Salzburg, Confirmation of Suffragans of, 210
 „ *See* of, 297, 298
 „ Communion in both kinds refused in, 303
 Sampson (*de Vera Obedientia præstanda*), 341
 Samson, 68
 Sanderson, Bishop, 396
Sandomir, Consensus of, 407-8
 Sapienza (University of Rome), 434
 Saravia, 374, 382
 Sarpi, Fra Paolo, 442-4
 Sarum Breviary, 327, 345
 Savoy, 441

- Saxon, Lower, Circle, affected by
Edict of Restitution, 311
- Saxony, 83, 121, 292
- „ Augustus of, 287, 289, 291
- „ in Thirty Years War, 309,
313, 314
- „ John Frederick (*see*
Maurice of Saxony,
Frederick, John), 115
- „ Lutheran organisation in,
57
- „ religious changes in (Cal-
vinism), 291, 292
- Scaliger, 381, 387, 389
- Schwenkfeld condemns Justifica-
tion, 130
- Science and the Church, 450
- Scripture. *See* Trent
- Scandinavia, kingdoms of, 85 *seq.*,
398 *seq.*
- „ Reformation in, 93
- Schinner, Cardinal, Bishop of
Sion, 69
- Schleswig-Holstein, 56, 83
- „ Frederick of, 89, 90
- Scotists and Thomists (*see* Duns),
33
- Scotland, state of Church in (and
Presbyterianism), 347,
363, 364, 366
- „ Lutheranism in, 347-8
(*See* also Knox, Presbyterianism.)
- Schwerin, See of, 293, 316
- Seculars, reformation of, at Trent,
240, 243
- Secularisation of Sees in Germany,
23, 84, 292-3
- „ of monasteries, 305
- Secularised land by Peace of
Prague, 315
- „ sees and lands by
Treaty of Westphalia, 316-17
- Sees, secularisation of, in Germany,
292-3
- „ new, in England, 338
- Seltan-Segued, 422-3
- Seminaries, clerical, 220
- Septuagint, 436
- Seripando, Legate at Trent, 134,
174
- Seripando, General of Augustin-
ians, 185, 194, 207, 209, 212
- Servites and Sarpi, 443
- Settlement, the Elizabethan, 358,
361-2
- Severina, Cardinal San, 440
- Sfondrati, Gregory XIV., 439
- Shimun Mar, 422
- Sickingen, Franz von, 36, 42
- Sigismund of Brandenburg
(Bishop), 293
- „ I. (Poland), 404-5
- „ II. „ 405-6, 409
- „ III. „ 410, 415
- „ (Sweden), 401
- Sillery, 427
- Silesia, 56, 83, 307, 310
- Simeon Barmama, 422
- Simonetta, Legate at Trent, 174,
185, 186, 203, 206,
250
- „ relations with col-
leagues, 186, 196
- Simonis, Menno (Friesland), 377
- Sion (Sitten), Cardinal of. *See*
Schinner
- Sitten, Cardinal of. *See* Schinner
- Sistine Library (Vatican), 436
- Sixtus IV. (*see* Popes), 3
- „ V. *See* Popes
- Slavery and missions, 425-7
- Smalkald, League of, 81, 113,
115
- „ War, 140
- Socinians, 385, 404-5, 408
- Socinus, Lælius, 408
- „ Faustus, 408
- Somerset, Protector, 349, 353
- Sorbonne and Jesuits, 393-5
- „ and Index, 182
(*See* France, and University
of Paris.)
- Soto, 199, 207
- Spain, 386
- „ reform in, 4, 12-14, 264
- „ religious types in, 386
- „ and England, 358, 437
- „ and France (*see* also
France), 437
- „ Moors in, 12

- Spain and Treaty of Westphalia, 319
 „ causes of its decay, 386-7
 Spanish bishops, 207, 209, 214, 234, 249
 „ colonies (missions), 424-7
 „ Dominicans (Jacobites) and Justification, 134
 „ theologians, 14, 177, 200
 Speier (Spire), 292
 „ Diet of (1526), 53, 54
 „ „ (1529), 58, 78
 „ Edict of (1529), 59-60
 „ Protestation of, 59-62
 Spire. *See* Speier
 Stancari, 408
 S. Lawrence, missions along, 427
 Stoglav, the (Hundred Chapters), 413
 Staphylus, 175, 204
 Stapulensis, Faber, 95
 States accept Decrees of Trent, 251
 „ the Papal. *See* Papal States, also Temporal power
 Standish, Dr. (Minorite or Franciscan), 322
 Staupitz, von, 8, 27, 31
 Stephens, Robert (Étienne), 389
 „ Henry („), 389
 Stein, 25
 Stockholm, massacre of, 86
 Strassburg, 60, 71, 80, 292, 294, 305, 306, 316
 Stures (in Sweden), 86
 Styria, Nunciature for, 301-5, 307
 Saurez, 136, 390
 Succession, Act of, 335
Sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, the, by Friar Thomas, 430
 Sulakas, John, 422
 Supremacy in Ireland, 371-2
 „ Royal, 322-3, 333, 335, 337, 339, 351
 Supreme Head (*see* also Supremacy), 333, 360
 Sweden, 86, 399-402
 „ Lutheranism in, 87, 88, 399-401
 Sweden, Calvinists in, 399, 401
 „ and Formula of Concord, 292
 „ Gustavus I., 87
 „ Eric XIV., 89, 399
 „ Gustavus Adolphus, 313 *seq.*, 402
 „ John III., 399 *seq.*
 „ Sigismund, 401
 „ Charles IX., 402
 „ Christina, 402
 Swiss College at Milan, 268
 Switzerland, 63 on
 „ Federal government in, 63
 „ Federal government in (chap. xii.), 69-71, 380
 „ weakness of Episcopacy in, 64
 „ and Anabaptists, 73-4
 „ Counter - Reformation, 269
 „ independent of empire, 316
 Synods :
 Frequent medieval, 20
 Revival of, 10
 Scheme of frequent, 152
 Proposed sphere of, 159
 Cranmer's wish for, 340
 Proposed national, 172, 216
 And Trent, 159
 Of Bresc, 410
 Synod of Constantinople, 417
 „ Dort (Dordrecht), 370
 „ Jassy, 417
 „ Jerusalem, 418
 „ Kiev, 418
 „ Thorn, 408
 „ Tours, 17
 Tadoussac, 427
 Tartars, inroads of, 403
 Tausen, Hans, 91
 Taylor, Jeremy, 374
 Temporal power of Popes (*see* Papacy), 4, 16, 429
 Teresa, S., 266, 386

Testament in modern Greek, 416
 Tetzel, 31, 33
 Theatines, the, 9, 266
 Theology, lectures on, 138, 448
 " study of, 448
 " thought, change in,
 175-6
 " among Lutherans, 289,
 297
 " among Calvinists, 385
Thesaurus (Étienne), 389
 Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster,
 352
 Thirty Years War, events leading
 to, 294, 303, 305-8
 Outline of, 309-16
 And Papacy, 312, 446-7
 Thomas of Jesus, Fr., 430-1
 Thomists, the (*see* Aquinas), 94,
 177
 " and Scotists, 33,
 465-6
 Thorn, Synod of, 408
 Three Rivers, 427
 Thurn, Count (Bohemia), 308
 Tiene, Gaetano di, 266
 Tilly, Count, 309, 313
 Toledo, Archbishop of. *See*
 Ximenes, Carranza
 Toleration, Declaration of, 286, 300
 Augsburg, Peace of, 120, 286,
 295, 300
 Peace of Prague, 315
 Treaty of Westphalia, 317
 Toletus, 259
 Torgau, League of, 78
 Tournai, *See* of, 376
 Tours, Synod of (1510), 17
 Transubstantiation, 75, 156, 344
 Transylvania, Reformation in, 299
 Treaty. *See* Kadan, Ulm, West-
 phalia, Xanten
 Trent, Council of:
 Session I., 127
 " II., 128
 " III., 128
 " IV., 129
 " V., 129-32, 138
 " VI., 132 *seq.*, 143-4
 " VII., 145-8

Trent, Council of:
 Session VIII., 149
 Suspension, 149
 Session IX., 151
 " X., 151
 Reassembling, 151
 Session XI., 151
 " XII., 152-3
 " XIII., 153-9
 " XIV., 159-64
 " XV., 165
 " XVI., 166
 Interval of two years, 167-73
 Session XVII., 175-81
 " XVIII., 181-5
 " XIX., 185-90
 " XX., 191-3
 " XXI., 193-6
 " XXII., 196-206
 " XXIII., 217-22
 " XXIV., 223-33
 " XXV., 239-48
 Recitation of all Decrees, 249
 Close, 249
 Trent, Council of—Topics:
 Baptism, Holy, 145-6
 Benefices, 147, 164, 186, 195
 Bishops, residence of, 137-9,
 141, 147, 157, 186-9, 201,
 207-8, 211, 217, 218, 227 *seq.*,
 234, 238, 244-7
 Bishops, Titular, 144, 216-17
 " election and confirma-
 tion, 227
 Carranza, Archbishop, trial of,
 236-7
 Catechism, 229
 Chapters, Cathedral, 229
 " reform of, 243
 Clergy, residence of, 143, 147,
 218
 Communion in both kinds,
 191-4, 199, 202-3, 214, 262,
 288, 302
 Discussion postponed, 194
 Confession (penance, contrition,
 and attrition), 160, 162-3
 Confirmation, 146
 Curia, 137, 143, 189, 262
 Decrees, publication of, 243

Trent, Council of—Topics :

- „ public acceptance of, by Council, 243
- „ acceptance of, by nations, 251
- „ commended to princes, 248-9
- „ confirmed by Pope, 250
- „ numbers signing at close, 250

Divorce, 223-6

Eucharist, Holy (*see* Mass), 153-7, 191-4, 196, 199

Expectatives, 229

Index, 181-5

„ left to Pope, 248

Indulgences, Decree upon, 239, 247

Initiative, 142, 181, 208, 214, 222, 232, 235

Inquisition (*see* Carranza), 234-5

Justification, 130-7

Marriage, 206, 216, 223-6

Masses, regulation of, 244

Minor and Major Orders, 217-19

Orders, Holy, ordination, 163-4, 195, 206-7, 216-19

Original sin, 130-1

Papal authority, 128, 201, 209-12, 263

„ „ reserved, 245

Penance, 159, 162-3, 229

Pluralities, 229

Princes, reform of, 230

Procedure, ecclesiastical, 229, 238, 244

Provisions, 229

Purgatory, Decree upon, 240, 247

Questers, 195, 247

Reformation, 124-5, 137-8, 143-4, 147, 157-9, 163-4, 181, 189, 195, 200-1, 204-6, 218-22, 225-30, 233, 241 *seq.*

Reform and doctrine, order of discussion, 128

„ forty-two chapters on, proposed, 231

Regulars, Reformation of, 239

Reservations, 229

Trent, Council of—Topics :

Rule of Faith, 129

Residence. *See* Bishops, and Clergy

Sacraments generally, 145

Saints, Invocation of, 240

Scripture, 129

Seculars, reformation of, 243

Seminaries, 219-22

Style of Council, 127

Theology, lectures on, 138

Unction, Extreme, 159, 163

Venice, Patriarch of, tried, 237

Visitations, 144, 229

Vulgate, 129, 258-60

Trent, Council of (history of), 36, chaps. vii., viii., ix.

Its constitution, 127

Demand for, 123

Mantua, called at, 125

Vicenza, at, 126

Summoned at Trent, 126

Outlook for, 125, 161, 179

Organisation of, 127, 161, 180-222

Title of, 127, 182

Legates presiding :

Del Monte, Cervini, Pole, 127, 141

Crescenzo, helped by Pighino and Lippomani, 151, 161

Gonzaga, du Puy, Hosius, Simonetta, Seripando, d'Altemps, 174-5, 192, 196, 211

Deaths of Gonzaga and Seripando, 212

Morone and Navagero, 212-13

Canons and Decrees, 142

Close proposed, 159

Parties and Debate :

Papal regulations for, 232-3

Difficulties of debate, 133-4, 141, 237

Reform of Curia, 137, 143, 189, 262

Parties and relations :

Pope, 209-12, 232-3, 245, 261-3

Charles V., 115, 149, 152-3

- Trent, Council of (history of)—
 Parties and relations :
 Ferdinand I., 167-8, 193,
 202-6, 213-15, 232
 France, 152-3, 188, 231-5
 France and Spain, 222
 England (Elizabeth), 173,
 215, 358
 Protestants, 118, 149, 160,
 179
 ,, safe-conduct for,
 160-1, 165, 181
 Imperialist party, 128, 181,
 231 *seq.*
 Spanish bishops, 129, 142,
 190, 200, 214, 234
 Archbishop of Granada re-
 fuses "Placet," 249
 Canonists and theologians,
 178
 Jesuits, 134, 161, 175-9, 199,
 200
 Curia, 137, 143, 189, 262
 Initiative, 142, 181, 208, 214,
 222, 232, 235
 Transference and suspension,
 116, 148-9
 Suspension for two years (1552),
 165-6
 Called again (1560), 173.
 Continuation or a new assembly,
 174, 181, 188, 190, 232-3
 Preparations for close, 238
 Recitation of Decrees, 249
 Numbers present, 141, 175, 249
 Reforms, general effect of, 245-6
 Sequel :
 Catechism, Vulgate, Breviary,
 Mass, Music, and Decrees,
 251-62
 Trent, Cardinal of. *See* Madruzzo
 ,, why chosen for Council, 126
 ,, cause of sudden close of
 Council, 250
 ,, summary of results of
 Council, 261-2
 ,, Decrees of, and acceptance,
 251-2, 379
 ,, *History of Council* (Sarpi),
 443
 Tridentine doctrine of Justifica-
 tion (*see* Trent, Council of),
 467-8
 Trier, *See* of (Trèves), 295
 Trolle, Gustav, Archbishop of
 Upsala, 86
 Trondhjem (Nidaros), 85, 92
 ,, Eric, Archbishop of, 86
 Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, 334
 Turks, the, 21, 299, 300-2, 411,
 430
 Ukraine Cossacks, 410
 Ulm, 60
 ,, Treaty of, 309
 Ulrich. *See* Württemberg, and
 Hutten
 Unction, Extreme. *See* Trent
 Uniat Church of Chaldea, 422
 ,, in Pòland, 410-11
 Uniformity, Act of, 352
 Union, Protestant (1608-48), 309
 ,, of Lutherans and Bohemian
 Brethren (Poland), 407-8
 Unitarians (*see* Socinians), 404-5
 United Provinces, 316, 379-80
 Universities and Council of Trent
 (visitation, etc.), 243-4
 Alcala, 274, 282
 Cambridge, 341, 363, 369
 Copenhagen, 86
 Cracow, 403, 408
 Dillingen, 297
 English, 327, 338
 Erfurt, 8, 36
 German, 11, 28
 Heidelberg (Erastus), 383
 Ingolstadt, 34, 303, 448
 Jena, 289
 Leyden, 381-4
 Louvain, 39, 40
 Oxford, 368
 Paris, 394-5
 ,, (Sorbonne), 40, 94, 182,
 394-5
 Prague (Prag), 299
 Rome (Sapienza), 434
 Spanish, 14
 Salamanca, 274, 282
 Tübingen, 414

